This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07597489 3

Sihai

# The National Social Science Series

*Edited by Frank L. McVey, Ph.D., LL.D.,*
*President of the University of Kentucky*

**Now Ready: Each, Sixty Cents Net**

PROPERTY AND SOCIETY. A. A. BRUCE, Associate Justice Supreme Court, North Dakota, Commissioner on Uniform State Laws, etc.

WOMEN WORKERS AND SOCIETY. ANNIE M. MACLEAN, Assistant Professor of Sociology, The University of Chicago.

SOCIOLOGY. JOHN M. GILLETTE, Professor of Sociology, The University of North Dakota.

THE FAMILY AND SOCIETY. JOHN M. GILLETTE.

THE AMERICAN CITY. HENRY C. WRIGHT, First Deputy Commissioner Department of Public Charities, New York City.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE IN THE UNITED STATES. CARL C. PLEHN, Professor of Finance, The University of California.

THE COST OF LIVING. WALTER E. CLARK, Professor and Head of the Department of Political Science, The College of the City of New York.

TRUSTS AND COMPETITION. JOHN F. CROWELL, Associate Editor of the *Wall Street Journal.*

MONEY. WILLIAM A. SCOTT, Director of the Course in Commerce, and Professor of Political Economy, The University of Wisconsin.

BANKING. WILLIAM A. SCOTT.

TAXATION. C. B. FILLEBROWN, President Massachusetts Single Tax League.

THE CAUSE AND CURE OF CRIME. CHARLES R. HENDERSON, late Professor of Sociology, The University of Chicago.

THE STATE AND GOVERNMENT. JEREMIAH S. YOUNG, Professor of Political Science, The University of Minnesota.

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT. G. R. DAVIES, Assistant Professor of History and Sociology, The University of North Dakota.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CITIZENSHIP. ARLAND D. WEEKS, Professor of Education, North Dakota Agricultural College.

STATISTICS. WM. B. BAILEY, Professor of Practical Philanthropy, Yale University, and JOHN CUMMINGS, Expert Special Agent, Bureau of the Census.

WOMEN AND THE FRANCHISE. JOSEPHINE SCHAIN, Executive Secretary, Association of Neighborhood Workers, New York City.

## In Preparation

SOCIAL INSURANCE IN THE UNITED STATES. GURDON RANSOM MILLER, Professor of Sociology and Economics, Colorado State Teachers' College.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE. A. B. HALL, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

THE NEWSPAPER AS A SOCIAL FACTOR. ALLAN D. ALBERT, Former Editor *Minneapolis Tribune.*

THE STRUGGLE FOR LAND IN AMERICA. CHARLES W. HOLMAN, Expert of United States Industrial Commission.

MODERN PHILANTHROPY. EUGENE T. LIES, General Superintendent, Chicago United Charities.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LEGISLATION. JEREMIAH S. YOUNG.

POPULATION. E. DANA DURAND, Professor of Statistics, The University of Minnesota.

COOPERATION. L. D. H. WELD, Professor of Business Administration, Yale University.

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY AS A SOCIAL FACTOR. W. D. JOHNSTON, Librarian, St. Paul Public Library.

# WOMEN AND THE FRANCHISE

By

JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

Executive Secretary
Association of Neighborhood Workers
New York City

CHICAGO
A. C. McCLURG & CO.
1918

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
835667
ASTOR LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1918 L

Copyright
A. C. McClurg & Co.
1918

Published March, 1918

*Copyrighted in Great Britain*

W. F. HALL PRINTING COMPANY, CHICAGO

## EDITOR'S PREFACE

A BOOK on Women and the Franchise would seem to be in order. Miss Josephine Schain, one of the younger leaders in the suffrage movement, has prepared the manuscript. The book is a frank presentation of the suffrage viewpoint. It is not an intensive study of the results of woman's participation in politics, but a review of the arguments against women's voting and a re-statement of the reasons why the franchise should be extended to them. The pleasing style and clear enumeration of the arguments, both pro and con, make the book worth the perusal of the reader to the end.

F. L. M.

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

"OF WHAT use were words from a mind tuned in one key to a mind tuned in another?" asks one of Galsworthy's characters in *The Freelands.* So at times prejudices do seem so ingrained that words are futile, especially when one tries to present so colossal a cause as justice to women. But, after all, there is a faith within those of us who believe in a better order, which keeps alive the hope that the many minds making up public opinion may eventually become harmonized and that the ballot will be granted women. In the hope of playing some part toward bringing about this order, this volume is written.

We who believe in woman suffrage are optimists, and indeed we have good reason to be in the present day as we see the victories come piling in. We have faith in people. We believe in the fundamental truth that the uncommon good may be found in the common man if the chance is given for development, and that this applies to the woman as well as to the man. We desire that women may have the privilege of sharing the great experiences of life, that they may have freedom of thought and spirit, and emancipation from tradition's iron hand

which has held back womankind of all nations and races and from which they are at last freeing themselves.

Through the ages woman has been held in some form of subjection. In order to keep her in this position it almost seems as if every possible effort has been made to subjugate and degrade her. Not alone has she been ridiculed: she has been taught to despise her sex. As a remnant of this past attitude there may occasionally be found a woman of intelligence — some may claim that this term is paradoxical — who still looks upon woman as inferior to man. But, in spite of it all, woman has climbed upward, driven by a force of which she little knew the reason. Not alone for herself has she worked and striven against abuse, maltreatment, and misunderstanding, but always carrying on her back the burdens of the race of which she is the mother.

Some of the most dramatic personalities in the drama of the world's history have been the figures of women, who, out of the darkness and depression, held high the torch of hope to light womankind on her climb out of slavery. There have been dark and dismal ages when it seemed that all gains were slipping away, when it seemed as though there was no hope; but we of this generation are privileged to live at a time when woman finally is coming into her own and is gaining recognition. The past has had its Sappho, Joan of Arc, and other master minds,

but never was there a time when such opportunities of self-expression were so possible for all women. At last the prophecy is coming true, the time is dawning when man and woman shall stand on the same footing fighting together for a better life. To interpret this to mean that she stands forth a perfect being or that all of her problems are solved, is absurd; but it means rather that she is being acknowledged as worthy of recognition and beginning to be counted as is her due.

We ask for suffrage for women because we want them to have the right to develop; because we are opposed to the stifling of individual initiative. Society is only too apt to try to smother any expression of new ideas with the penalty of social ostracism for those who dare to express opinions different from those which are commonly accepted, though often the only reason for the accepted standards is the lack of mental energy sufficient to blaze new paths. On the one hand, we condemn every new expression of thought, while on the other hand we are forced to acknowledge that many of the heroes of the past to whom we do honor are those who dared to stand out against the current standards and ideals and had ideas ahead of their times. It is a continuous performance, this struggle between the old and the new. The radicals of today are the conservatives of tomorrow, yet seemingly we shall never realize this enough to give freedom of ex-

pression and individual initiative their right. Each age struggles to crush the oncoming generation of thought and progress. Perhaps no better illustration can be found of this than the history of the progress of woman of which the demand for the ballot is one step. With leaps and bounds woman's opportunities have opened up, especially in the last six or seven years. Argument after argument has been swept aside by realities, by women proving their capabilities in the various fields. We ask that this shall continue, encouraging ourselves with the knowledge that there would be no progress were it not for those visionaries who are claimed by vociferous reactionaries of every age to be dragging society into a deep abyss.

JOSEPHINE SCHAIN.

# CONTENTS

PAGE

**Chapter I.** INFLUENCES OF THE PAST . . . . . 1

The status of woman in Primitive Society—Woman in Ancient Society—Woman in the Middle Ages—Woman in the Colonial Period.

**Chapter II.** THE AWAKENING OF WOMAN . . . 20

Changes affecting woman's status—The Industrial Revolution and its effect upon the home and woman's work—The demand of woman for an education and the results—Legal changes.

**Chapter III.** THE DEVELOPMENT OF WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE . . . . . 35

The right of franchise a group development—Discrediting of the "Divine Right of Kings"—Discarding of property qualifications—Removal of religious restrictions—Removal of race restrictions.

**Chapter IV.** THE MEANING OF WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE 52

Democracy and the right of people to govern themselves—The potential power of the ballot—Woman's voice needed in politics—Protection of the Home—Protection of women outside the home.

**Chapter V.** PROGRESS OF THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT 70

Woman Suffrage proven practicable—Growth of the Suffrage Movement—Results in the states where women vote.

**Chapter VI.** OBJECTIONS ANSWERED . . . . . 84

Fear of a change—Woman and chivalry—The immigrant problem—Woman and war—The real enemies of Woman Suffrage.

PAGE

**Chapter VII.** THE FORWARD TREND . . . . . 101

The present "restlessness" among women—Its effect on the home—Development of the modern woman—Marriage relationships—Economic liberty—Single standard of morals—Development of sex loyalty—Future hopes.

REFERENCES . . . . . 123

INDEX . . . . . 125

# WOMEN AND THE FRANCHISE

# Women and the Franchise

## CHAPTER I

### INFLUENCES OF THE PAST

WE ARE creatures of custom. Drastic measures are often necessary to rouse us from the grooves into which we have sunk while stupidly clinging to the past. Tradition too often outweighs wisdom, and the preponderance of evidence demanded is frequently greater than conditions justify. Because people are so blinded by past tradition, energy, time, and money have to be expended to make them see the self-evident facts in woman's demand for the ballot.

Over and over again, in appealing for some new progressive measure affecting women, one is met by opposition based on the fear of a change. There are those who speak of "Woman's Sphere," as though through all the ages women have done exactly the same things; as though the Creator in placing women on the earth had enunciated certain laws and principles and meted out certain bounds

beyond which she should not go, and that these laws had been given into the hands of men to be interpreted and enforced.

In order to understand the modern woman, to comprehend the significance of her present "restlessness," we must know something of the place woman has held in the world's history. We are apt to think that there is nothing so fixed and certain as the conditions that happen to prevail about us We fail to take into consideration the constant changes that have been taking place from the beginning of time, and to recognize that conditions affecting woman's work and her place in the world have changed also.

We are living in a most heartening age as we see woman coming more fully into her own. Though sometimes our spirits are weighted with doubt, and the inevitable mistakes that come with any such fundamental change loom large, we are able to console ourselves with the knowledge that the dust of the battle is often blinding. At last aroused to the unfair conditions that have surrounded her in the past, we now see woman pressing on with determination but with little bitterness, looking forward to that time when she shall have freedom of opportunity and expression and may truly be a partner with man.

Although at certain periods in the upward struggle of humanity women in general have held posi-

tions of great respect and opportunity, the story of womankind as a whole has been tragic. As Herbert Spencer has said:

> In the history of humanity as written, the saddest part concerns the treatment of women; and had we before us its unwritten history we should find this part still sadder. I say the saddest part because, though there have been many things more conspicuously dreadful — cannibalism, the torturings of prisoners, the sacrificing of victims to ghosts and gods — these have been but occasional; whereas the brutal treatment of women has been universal and constant.*

This may seem like a shocking statement to those who have thought only of woman as she is protected and cared for in modern society in the loving American home. All that such as these need to do is to look back over history in its relation to women, or to note classes of women in modern society with whom Fate has not dealt so gently.

Let us, then, review in brief the progress of the world as it has affected woman. It is only as we do this that we can fully discuss the present demand for her political enfranchisement. It is only as we have a historical background that we can fairly comprehend the meaning of the more modern movements affecting woman.

Under the plan of nature, the female sex is the basic sex we are told by sociologists. According

* *Principles of Ethics,* Vol. 2, p. 335.

to the gynecocentric theory, "the female sex is primary and the male sex secondary in the organic scheme." Lester F. Ward, from his study of anthropoids and the life of primitive peoples, comes to the conclusion that the female sex was dominant. It was woman who exercised the power of selection and was the ruling sex. He says:

> The female is the guardian of hereditary qualities. The female is the balance wheel of the whole machinery. As the primary, ancestral trunk, she stands unmoved amid the heated strife of rivals and holds the scales that decide their relative worth to the race. While the voice of nature, speaking to the male in the form of an intense appetitive interest, says to him: fecundate! it gives to the female a different command, and says: discriminate! The order to the male is: cross the strains! that to the female is: choose the best! *

Havelock Ellis bears testimony to this theory when he says:

> The female is the mother of the new generation, and has the closer and more permanent connection with the care of the young; she is thus of greater importance than the male from Nature's point of view.†

Accordingly, in the early stages of woman's development, we find the female exercising the right of selection and governing the development of the horde; but with the development of the reasoning

---

* *Pure Sociology*, p. 325.
† *Man and Woman*, p. 383.

power of man and the discovery of his relation to woman and her offspring, a fundamental change took place, and the subjection of woman began. Because of his greater physical strength, woman was at his mercy. Through the ages since then she has been repressed, and only with the recent awakening of the social conscience has thought been given to the effect, not alone on her, but on society in general. What the world has lost by this age-long subjection of woman cannot be estimated. I again quote from Lester F. Ward:

> At some point quite early in the protosocial stage, it began slowly to dawn upon the growing intellect of man that a causal connection existed between these couplings of men and women and the birth of children. It was this simple act of ratiocination that literally reversed the whole social system. For the first time man began to perceive that he, too, had a part in the continuance of the race, that the children were in part his, and not wholly the woman's. But when the causal connection finally became generally recognized, and a parental relation of the father admitted, he was naturally disposed to claim his title to the offspring.*

Gone then was his former reverence for the female sex; gone was her right of selection. He no longer continued to hold her in the former respected position. He no longer looked upon her as the almost superhuman being upon whom alone

* *Pure Sociology*, p. 341.

depended the future of the human race, who held in complete control the destinies of the child. She was no longer more important than he. It was then but a short step to complete domination of the female by the male.

Her fortunes since then have been many and varied. Strength being the test among primitive peoples, privileges went to the stronger, the man, and the burdensome tasks became hers. Fighting and hunting were his chief occupations; these she could not take part in as it was her duty to bear as many children as possible in order to strengthen the tribe, and, burdened by her young, the chase was physically out of the question.

Subject, then, to the will of man, she became the beast of burden. Hers was the duty of caring for the family, tilling the soil, making the clothing, and doing all menial tasks. In the evolution of the race, she played an important part in the development of the various occupations. She was not only the first cook, but she was the first industrial worker, the first doctor, the first agriculturist. Through necessity and ingenuity, woman developed many of the phases of labor that have since been taken over by man and are now considered his sphere.

Among the Indian tribes and peoples on far out of the way islands and isolated places, where tribal life still exists in a primitive stage of development, women will be found doing the labor and carrying

the burdens. As tribes ceased their wanderings and began to live a more settled life, man appropriated many of the outdoor occupations developed by woman and her work began to be limited to indoor tasks. Although many of her forms of labor had changed from period to period, there had been no change in her status so far as the relation to her mate was concerned. With few exceptions, she has been his subject and property through all the ages, since the breakdown of the gynecocratic régime and the establishment of androcracy.

Slowly and laboriously upward stumbled the human race through the countless ages, leaving little record by which we can judge of the struggles and changes. We come finally to certain periods in ancient history in which woman had apparently more freedom than in any period up to the present generation. Even many of these bright spots, however, become clouded when we realize that, while the women of the ruling families were treated with some thought and consideration, the life of the women of the lower classes was one of humiliation and toil.

In the Homeric age the women of Greece had practically no rights, as they were entirely under the domination of man. Life at that age was not complex; the ability to be warriors determined all rights, consequently the women, being dependent upon the men for protection, were subject to them in civil

life. Nevertheless, the domestic life which Homer depicts is one of happiness and harmony, the wife being content with merely caring for her household and asking no questions about rights and social justice.

Under the Spartan state, legislation affecting women was shaped with one end alone in view: the development of a state of strong men. Woman's one function was motherhood. Everything else took a secondary place. Girls were taught to obey their fathers, and on marriage their obeisance was to their husbands. The woman's prime work was child-bearing, and man looked after all else. Strong men, and, of necessity, strong women, was the demand of the age. Generally speaking, all else was relegated to the background. The results of thus emphasizing the physical side were at first a marvelous and a wonderful race. But with the emphasis so strongly placed on the physical, it was not long before the breakdown came and the degeneration of Sparta began. An exception, however, might be noted of a small group of patrician women, who, although under the guardianship of men, were otherwise generally free. They were given a public education and played an important part in public affairs.

No reference to the influence and position of the women of Greece would be complete without mention of Sappho. It was she who held out the first

hope that woman's position in the future might be different. A brilliant scholar and leader, she drew about her a coterie of women rebellious at the monotony of their lives. She encouraged them to develop with the hope that some day their sex might have freedom. She was able to grasp fundamentals and dared to strike at the restrictions with which their lives were spun around, and which she felt were detrimental to progress.

In Athens were two classes of women; in one were the wives and daughters of the citizens. They were kept at home and in ignorance, their interests being confined entirely to household duties. The severest restrictions were placed upon these women and their contact with the outside world was limited. Religious festivals and funerals seem to have been their only dissipation. For breaking bounds the punishment was great, as citizenship had to be kept pure, and the idea seemed to prevail that only immoralities on the part of women affected the strain. These women were married early in life and no opportunities were given them for education, consequently many had little attraction for their husbands, who were highly educated. The men sought companionship among the second group of women, who were not citizens and were free from restrictions of every sort. Laws could not be passed for their benefit, and as they could not claim protection from the state, they were not allowed to marry. Instead,

many became the intimates of the citizens of Athens. They were brilliant, educated women, and wielded great power over the statesmen and politicians. But while many of these women, it is true, led brilliant lives — and the records of the age include fascinating stories of their influence — there were untold numbers of their sex who suffered under the baseness of the system.

Asphasia, who was the companion of Pericles and one of the most remarkable women in history, tried to arouse the women citizens to strive for a higher standard in their lives; to become educated and to fit themselves for companionship with their husbands and to help do away with the existing standards for women. She realized the need for women asserting themselves in order to acquire status and to break down the subjection to men under which both classes of women labored. But though her influence in this respect was great with men as well as with women, permanent results cannot be recorded because of the political changes affecting Greece just at that time.

In the earlier stages of Roman history, as in the records of all nations, we find the husband had complete control of the wife and her property. Women were looked upon as children and treated accordingly by the master-hand. Caste, of course, counted and the treatment accorded women varied with the group. Farthest down the line we find the

female slave who was kept for breeding purposes, the propagation of offspring being the thing most desired by her master.

Dress reform was a problem in those days—another proof of the fact that there is nothing new under the sun. Statesmen legislated in regard to women's clothes, dictating how they should dress, much to the chagrin of the women of that age, who rose in open protest. The matter came before the statesmen for debate, and Livy took up the cudgels against the women, for he feared that if they were given freedom in this matter there would be no end to their demands. This was the beginning of woman's influence in legislative matters in Rome, and women were often found after that taking an active part in favor of, or in opposition to, measures before the lawmakers.

The citizen woman at first was always under the guardianship of some man, but this condition of affairs finally broke down. Men began bequeathing large sums to their wives and daughters, and as a result there arose a group of wealthy women. The Romans tried to check this tendency, but the fathers and husbands evaded the law by having guardians appointed who swore to see that the money went to the women. The courts eventually recognized those bequests, and finally the right to hold property was granted to women. This change in the laws of property began to have its effect on marriage, importance

of position developing as a result of wealth, and marriage becoming a contract and dowry accompanying the daughter so that she was financially cared for by her own family. The next change to evolve was that women could no longer be compelled to marry.

Finally, the position of woman under the Roman law became a liberal one. She was not secluded but allowed great freedom of person. She was granted liberal property rights, often possessing vast wealth, and she had the right to dispose of it as she pleased. Although not allowed the right to vote, she took an active interest in public affairs and a legislative body petitioned by women was no uncommon thing in those days. Free as she was, it must be remembered the old control of the husband over his wife was not entirely gone for he still held the right to the services of his wife.

The treatment of woman among the Asiatic nations has been one of cruelty from the beginning. From the earliest records, history shows that the place accorded her in these countries was one of degradation and suffering. Under the Hindu law the woman was the absolute property of her husband. She was called upon not only to obey him, but to worship him. The binding of the feet comes down to us as testifying to customs whose inception was based on humiliation and subjection. The religious beliefs in these countries helped to bring

about the abject position of women, and at the same time afforded little consolation to her. Mohammed denied to woman the possession of a soul. Under the religion which he established women were shut out from hope of a future life, which teaching aided in holding them in slavery. We know that in later times among certain religious sects in India the girl babies were thrown into the rivers as sacrifices to the gods. This is but one illustration of the treatment accorded throughout the ages to the women of India, and but one outward sign of the slight value placed upon their lives.

Going back to the history of Egypt, Pharaoh's daughter and Solomon's wife are examples of influence and power gained by the women of the ruling families. The women often took a prominent part in public affairs and wielded great power, but these perquisites belonged to those of high birth only, and not to the rank and file of women who were slaves both of their masters and husbands.

In the very early stages of the social revolution resulting from the birth of Christianity, no discrimination was made against women. The part that they took in the religious activities of the day bears testimony to a greater freedom than formerly. As a result of this revolution in thought and ideals one would suppose that women's freedom would have been extended even farther than it had been under the Roman Empire. But before many decades had

passed customs and teachings sprang up which clouded the doctrines of social justice enunciated by the Founder of Christianity, and women began to lose their position of equality.

The fathers of the church, as a result of their discussion of chastity, began to look upon woman as an evil influence — a tempter placed on earth to seduce man. By the third century most of the gains of former years were gone. Woman was again relegated to the four walls of her home, her freedom of thought and of action was lost, and a cloud of mistrust and contempt cast over her.

During the succeeding centuries there are meager records of the position of woman. One group — the Germanic tribes — stands out as unique in its treatment of its women. Not only had they personal freedom, but they played an important rôle in the government of the tribes. They were on an equal basis with the men, having the right to participate in the council of the state, hold property, and even act as rulers. They also accompanied the men when they went to battle, fighting shoulder to shoulder with them and nursing the wounded.

The period of chivalry was an interesting development which had its effect, not alone upon the women of the two centuries during which it had its vogue, but on women generations later. In fact, a skeleton of the old days is occasionally dragged forth in the form of the argument that chivalry will

disappear if the ballot is granted women. But history shows that the experiment of having chivalry as the basis in human relationship, rather than justice, has been tried and found wanting, and that a condition far from Utopia was the result.

Let us examine a little into this old order. In the eleventh century there arose groups of knights who pledged themselves, among other things, to protect not alone the princess with flowing locks that the romancer loves to depict, but the women of lower rank, women more defenseless than the be-castled damsel who ever watched from the tower for her warlike lover to return. Our emotions are tempted to sway with pride at having the weaker sex held in so high regard, until we remember that after all the number who joined in this movement was limited. Then, too, when we ask, "From whom did these warriors protect women?" the obvious answer "Men" shows that any class standard of ethics or morals is not sufficient.

We must judge the movement not alone from a statement of its interests and purposes, but also from the standpoint of its practical working out. The protection soon began to be limited to women of certain rank, and all others were open prey. The knight was supposed to be the protector of widows and orphans, but before long this ideal degenerated and his guardianship was used as a means of financial profit. Eventually the various orders became

corrupted and there was nothing left of the real idea at the end of the thirteenth century. With all its corruption, however, credit must be given to this movement for sowing the seed for a new attitude toward women by men.

We should expect to find our Pilgrim forefathers, revolting as they had from the tyranny of the Old-world order, and smarting under the injustices which they had suffered, keenly alive to the injustices which women were suffering; to find them advocates of freedom of thought, freedom of opportunity, and freedom of soul for women, as well as men. But, as ever, the ruling classes were unable to comprehend the viewpoint of those under their domination, and the women of America — in the new land of freedom — found themselves in practically the same position that they had been in in the Old World. Theirs were the tasks of old. Bounded by tradition, denied the right to think for themselves, to make decision according to the dictates of their own consciences, they set about to help build a new nation which, with pride, had been founded on the principles of democracy.

The Industrial Revolution had not as yet made its great inroads on woman's work. Most of the people still lived in rural sections, or in very small cities and towns, and life was the very simplest. Yet, if there be those who think that woman's life in this

period was an easy lot, all they need to do is to wander through some of the cemeteries of New England, and there they will find testimony showing the heavy toll demanded in lives of women and children who died under the terrific struggle while the history of our nation was in the making. We pay tribute to the Pilgrim Fathers, who braved the weary winters and the wild life in this new country, and forget that alongside each of them in the cemetery lie two, three, or four wives, who, too, did their part in starting us on our way — women who died at an early age because the tasks were more than they could physically bear.

The women of this period were all occupied in the home; that was the center of industry. There was enough work there for the wife, the daughters, and any dependent female relatives to do to keep them all busy. The wool was taken from the sheep's back and carried into the house, where it went through many processes before it finally became aprons for the girls and trousers for the small boy; the path from the cow barn to the kitchen was not broken by creameries, milk stations, and middlemen; the churning, the brewing, the baking, and making of the tallow candles was done at home; within the four walls of the home an endless number of industries were carried on. This old-time home was not alone a factory. The mother was the teacher; she was the nurse; and it was unusual if she was not the

doctor. Though she was required to do manifold things, she had little training and undertook these responsibilities at what seems to us now a pitifully early age. The world looked upon her as an old woman at fifty.

It is this picture that we are continually called upon to contemplate by those who are opposed to the political advancement of women; by those who sigh for the good old days and the times when women were contented with their lot and never murmured. But this picture was soon to meet a sorry fate. These blissful days were numbered, not alone from the physical side, but intellectually as well.

While the first rumblings of the Industrial Revolution were beginning to be heard, a few small voices were commencing to be raised in protest against the position of woman. There were those who were not satisfied with the old picture. Mary Wollstonecraft was the first to raise her voice in protest when, in 1792, she published her *Vindication of the Rights of Women;* and Harriet Martineau followed soon after with her challenge against the existing order. There was no middle ground, for once the old system began to break, the inevitable chain of events was set in motion. The new industrial system having begun to make inroads upon the home; the opportunity to learn to read and write once given women; the cup of liberty tasted —

and the result is the modern woman demanding an opportunity to develop to her utmost capacity. The floodgate of opportunities once opened, the crying of all the anti-suffrage forces could never put woman back into the idyllic picture or stop the wheels of progress.

# CHAPTER II

## THE AWAKENING OF WOMAN

MOST people think of the Industrial Revolution principally as a change in conditions affecting men. They think of the transition in the great industries of England; of the burning and rioting, the class hatred stirred up, and the long struggle for readjustment that took place before the workingmen could again find their balance in the industrial world. While the introduction of machinery brought great changes in man's work, these changes were small compared with the fundamental effect that it had upon woman.

We have seen how woman's work was confined to the four walls of the house, how all her time was taken up by the various processes carried on within the home. With the invention of machinery this work began to be taken out of the home into the factory, the store, and the shop, and woman began to follow her work. The old bake-oven turned into the commercial bakery, the washtub into the steam laundry, and the old spinning wheel that stood by the fireplace and of which the poets sang, sprang forth into a great factory system which has done

more to break down the old mold into which woman's life had been fitted for so many generations than any other influence since the beginning of time. When woman's work began to leave the four walls of the house it was inevitable that she could no longer be bound within those confines. It is here that many of those who are so constituted that they are continually looking backward, become confused. They fail to see that woman, with the changing of conditions, must also change; that she is bound to follow her work, and that the place of her labor is of secondary consequence. Women are in the working world to stay. We can no more go back to the time when all women could find "constructive occupation" in the home than we can go back to the time of homemade candles, homespun, and bake-ovens. We must acknowledge such self-evident facts and face our problems in the light of present-day conditions.

According to the estimates of students of labor problems, over eight million women in the United States are working outside the home. In 1840 the only occupations open to women were teaching, needlework, keeping boarders, typesetting, working in bookbinderies, in cotton mills, and domestic service. According to the last census report women are engaged in practically all divisions of industry. In the sudden and complete letting down of the bars, women have gone into industries in which they are

not physically fit to work. Occupations which used to be carried on in the home are now conducted under conditions which are detrimental to their health. These matters must be readjusted by legislation as time and opportunity permit; they are some of the complex social problems that woman's voice in politics is needed to help to solve.

Not only did a great part of the manual work of woman begin to leave the home with the invention of machinery, but the average mother was relieved of her duty as teacher with the introduction of the public school system. The church and Sunday school began to take over the religious instruction of the children, and with further social developments, and the consequent specialization of various types of work, many of her other homely duties have been taken from her.

The economic changes have meant the opening of newer and wider opportunities for women. On the other hand, in relieving the home of many of the old labors a new danger is presented, for certain favored groups of women who fail to realize their opportunities and responsibilities are tempted to abuse their leisure time in idleness and dissipation. We shall consider this phase of the question later on.

Even after part of woman's work began to be done in "man's" world, there was opposition to her going outside her home to work. Highly respect-

able, tradition-bound women boycotted the first merchant who employed women clerks. It was not opposition to women's working that caused the demonstration, because through the ages they have been forced to work without anything being said; it was the fact that women wished to choose their fields of labor that brought on the trouble. Women worked as scrub women in office buildings and nothing was said, but when they came to those same office buildings as lawyers and doctors, then it was that they were accused of neglecting their homes.

Changes due to the entrance of women into the industrial world were soon apparent. Having gained an economic consciousness, feeble though it was at first, interesting reactions began to set in. The first organized sign of a change was when a small group of women met at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848, and drew up a declaration of rights which seemed extremely revolutionary at that time. They asked for the education of women, a change in the laws relating to women which would give them legal recognition, and the right of franchise. Needless to say, the storm of protest and ridicule which this called forth was enough to frighten all but the staunchest advocates of these reforms. There were those among them unafraid of ridicule, and with the courage of their convictions they set about to gain the privileges that the women of America now

enjoy with little appreciation of the penalty that these few brave souls paid and the hardships they endured.

It is difficult to realize that there was a time when women were denied the right of an education, and that but such a short time ago. We need only review the life of Lucy Stone, a pioneer leader for the educational opportunities of women, to realize what penalty those first advocates paid for having a vision.

Lucy Stone was born in Massachusetts in 1818. At that time the educational opportunities for women were few, for there was no college in the country which had opened its doors to them, and the strongest feeling possible existed against one who took any active interest in community affairs or expressed an opinion on any subject — even religion. Lucy Stone's father was a well-to-do farmer who believed firmly in the old doctrine of the right of the husband to rule his wife and family. Born with a strong sense of justice and a consciousness of the wrongs her sex was subject to, she early in life determined to go to college and try and better the lot of her sisters. She received no encouragement from her father, who thought that her ideas were a disgrace to the family. He refused to aid her as he had helped her brothers. Little by little she earned enough money to take her to Oberlin, then the only college in the country that would admit a woman.

She earned her way through by doing housework at three cents an hour, and such other odd tasks as she could get to do. Several times during her course she was summoned before the ladies' board and the faculty because of the public expression of her opinions. She was selected to write an essay her commencement year, but was told that one of the professors would have to read it for her as it was unladylike and unchristian for a woman to appear in public. Needless to say, she refused to write under such conditions and went out from Oberlin onto the public platform — a scandalous thing for a woman to do at that time — to advocate her idea of educational freedom. That was in 1847. Forty years later Oberlin College called her back at the semi-centennial as one of the speakers, and bestowed great honors upon her as the forerunner of the modern idea of education for women.

Thus is summed up in one woman's life the progress of the right of education for womankind. Ridiculed, mobbed, and scorned because of her belief, she lived to see her demands realized. Thus in a half-century public sentiment changed from the belief that it was unwomanly and against the will of God for a girl to receive an education, to a time when women were allowed to stand on the platform with men, to enter college on equal terms, to share educational advantages on the basis of personal ability and not on the basis of sex. At last woman

has achieved recognition in the educational world, and it is no longer a disgrace for her to show she has brains.

It is significant to note that the arguments used against the education of girls were practically the same as those used at the present time against extending the franchise to women. It was the same opposition that arises against every step forward by women, the same fears and the same false prophecies. It was feared that an education would unfit a girl for her duties as wife and mother. Yet in this case, as in so many other cases, the change has been justified. While as late as 1870 many were debating and arguing as to whether feminine brains were capable of comprehending higher mathematics and the sciences, in 1917 the doors of all branches of education have been thrown wide open. More girls are graduating from the high schools than boys, and in many states educational laws have been passed compelling girls as well as boys to go to school.

A similar tale of struggle can be told of the women who first entered the professions. The medical profession was the first to recognize them. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell was the first woman in America to obtain a medical degree. It was a hard struggle for these pioneer women until 1891, when Johns Hopkins opened its doors to women. This gave precedent to the movement, and since then women

have been recognized on a different footing in this profession.

The legal profession came haltingly along. In 1869 the United States Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Illinois court refusing to admit to the bar a woman, who had been editor of the official law journal, on the ground that she was not only a woman but a married woman.

The right to enter the ministry was bitterly fought. The men had held so long the exclusive right to be keepers of the keys to salvation that the saving of souls had become a truly masculine profession, and they refused to give up their monopoly without a struggle. They held their point for a while by claiming that it was heresy to advocate allowing women to enter the ministry, but like other false barriers, this one, too, is beginning to fall.

Changes in the laws relating to women have not come as easily as the right of education. In the states where the demands have been granted, women often take their right to their wages, their children, and their property as a matter of course now that the law has been changed, and fail to realize that there still remain states where the laws are as backward as in the time of King George.

Most of the law in the United States is based on the Common Law of England. This is one of the choice heritages that our forefathers brought with them from England. Under this Common Law the

husband and wife were one — and that one the husband; a simple statement, but one that worked untold hardship. The wife had no legal existence, for the law gave the husband the custody of the wife's person. He had the sole ownership of her personal property, and the use of her real estate unless it was previously settled upon her. She had no control over the children, and the husband could do as he pleased with them. The absolute right to her earnings belonged to him, and payment to her without his consent did not cancel the debt. The wife during marriage had no part in the choice of the legal residence of the family; no right to make a will; she could not sue or be sued in her own name; and could not inherit property. Property bequeathed to her became the husband's, and he had the right to administer it, to collect earnings from it, and even to will it away at his death.

The few states that did not follow the Common Law used the Code Napoleon as their basis, and the amount of justice which women received under this code may be judged from the fact that Napoleon is credited with saying, when the rights of women were being discussed, "There is one thing that is not French, and that is that a woman may do as she pleases."

Many women suffered under the injustices of the law. For generations they endured it in their belief in a blind justice. But there arose groups in the

early part of the last century who, with the courage of their convictions, went forth seeking a new type of justice for women. In 1836, Ernestine Rose, an exile from Poland, sent the first petition to the New York legislature asking for a change in the laws relating to women. In 1848, Elizabeth Cady Stanton appeared before the legislature of the same state and asked for a change, and in that year the first married woman's property-rights bill was passed. Since then there has been a gradual evolution working toward the complete emancipation of woman as far as her property rights are concerned. There are still states where women have not yet realized their full rights in this respect; where they cannot control their own wages, and have no right to their own children, but with every year legislatures are changing these statutes.

The women who espoused the cause of legal justice met ridicule similar to that meted out to those who sought a change in public opinion with regard to educational advantages. The same arguments that are used against woman suffrage were used against giving women the right to their wages, the right to their property, and equal guardianship over their children with the husbands; but time has had a chance to prove that these changes were for the benefit of all, and woman now stands before the law as an individual.

Little by little woman's part in the opportunities

of the world has been enlarged. Every change advocated, whether great or small, has met with the same relentless opposition of ignorance, conservatism, and narrow range of vision. Great consternation reigned when the first perambulator containing a baby was wheeled down the street by the poor unsuspecting mother. Little did she realize that the vituperations of the village were to be turned upon her; that the minister would take her as the awful example for his Sunday's sermon; and that the proverbial "anti" would be there to prophesy the downfall of the home.

When Vassar College was established, the founders stated that one of the purposes was to give women a chance to have strong bodies as well as strong minds. This was a radical change because of the popularity of the interesting female invalid. The proper behavior of women at that time has been well expressed in the ditty,

> The bride of course fainted, for being acquainted
> With manners, she knew what was right.

But orthopedic shoes, the common sense dress, and the popularity of out-of-door sports for women are evidence of the fact that this old time-honored status of woman will soon be a thing of the past.

One of the salutary and significant forces in the life of American women is the club movement. Little did Ann Hutchinson know, when she drew about

her a little coterie of women in good old Massachusetts in the early part of the seventeenth century, that her idea, though unpopular at that time, would one day become a great force in the nation's life. The first Cambridge synod resolved with reference to the assemblages at Ann Hutchinson's, "That, though women might meet some few together, to pray and edify one another, yet, that such a set assembly as was then in practise at Boston, where sixty or more did meet every week, and one woman in a prophetical way by resolving questions of doctrine and expounding Scripture, took upon her the whole exercise, was disorderly and without rule." Thus was she banished from her state for starting the first woman's reading circle. But posterity often reverses earlier judgments, because it has the advantage of seeing the visions become realities. Recently a statue of Ann Hutchinson was placed in the Boston Public Library as a testimonial to her and an inspiration to other generations.

The campaign carried on in behalf of education stimulated many women who were deprived of a college education to form reading groups. The self-culture-club movement was at its height during the latter part of the last century. Small groups of women gathered together from one end of the country to the other to listen to papers on the Sphinx of Egypt, colonial silverware, and similarly irrelevant subjects. These clubs were the vogue in the

funny magazines for a while. Then something happened. The country awoke to find these little groups developed into a powerful organization known as the General Federation of Women's Clubs, with a membership numbering over two million, and reaching into all the large cities, practically every small town, and even into the remote countryside. From the beginning the Federation has been a democratic organization; in its membership are clubs owning magnificent club houses as well as groups of farmers' wives and tenement house mothers.

The Federation has been a great force in awakening the American woman to her social responsibilities. The desire for personal instruction has invariably led to an awakened interest in the abolition of restrictions surrounding women and the development of sex loyalty. Its effect has not ended there, for community responsibility can scarcely be separated from interest in the broader development of woman. Her vision has been widened and her efforts to fulfill her obligations to her community have found expression in the many well-formed organized committees through which the Federation carries on its work. No political party can boast of a platform more comprehensive than is the program of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Many look back over this past and wonder why it was necessary for women to have to fight for an education; why there could have been opposition

to giving them legal protection and the right to their children. The justice of these demands seems ridiculously apparent now that they are accomplished. At the present time other groups are fighting for changes, the justice of which seems to them just as obvious. It is primarily a question of vision; and only a matter of time until these hopes, too, are realized.

In every field and in every land, women are demonstrating that the faith of the pioneers was justified; that women's capabilities merely lay dormant, atrophied by the restrictions which they were subjected to for so long. The list is long, but the following illustrations show how wide the field of their endeavors: Katherine B. Davis, Commissioner of Corrections for New York City; Judge Mary Barelme, judge in the Children's Court of Chicago; Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, recently recognized by the government she fought so long; Mme. Shishkin Davein, sitting in the council which is making the new constitution for Russia; Dr. Yamei Kin, Chinese physician and humanitarian; Jeannette Rankin, a Member of Congress from the State of Montana; Mme. Curie, a scientist of the highest rank; Selma Lagerloff, who captured the Nobel Prize.

These are exceptional women, it is true, but their accomplishments cannot help but affect the status of all. It shows that the power lies within women to achieve, a thing that would not have been admitted

a century ago. All that was needed was the opportunity for them to use their capabilities in order to show that the ages of thraldom have been the barrier to intellectual achievement. A hopeful sign that the progress will continue is the attitude of young women who are leaving college, eager to do their part, no matter in what paths their lives lead them, and to push forward the standards by measuring up to the responsibilities placed upon them.

While there are still those who look back upon the generations past and feel that woman's life was ideal then; and while there are those who disagree, rehearsing the trials and discriminations against her, but who feel that the present age offers opportunities enough; there is an ever-increasing number who feel that the progress already made is significant, and demand that there be no halting by the wayside until all impediments are cast aside. Those with a forward vision believe that woman's past achievements justify greater opportunities, not alone because of what it means to her as an individual to have a fuller life, but because of her enhanced value to society if her talents are developed to the utmost.

## CHAPTER III

### THE DEVELOPMENT OF WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

THERE are some people who talk about male suffrage as though men had always had the right to the ballot; as though voting was something that belonged exclusively to the male sex, and that for women to ask for it was unwomanly because it had been man's right from the beginning of time. On the contrary, the average man has had the right to the ballot but a short time. A generation ago it was as inappropriate for the rank and file of men to ask to vote as some people seem to feel that it is now for the women to ask for this privilege.

Through many generations men have been struggling to have their opinions counted in the affairs of government. Class after class has gained this right through perseverance which often found expression in war. But as each group has attained its object, it has become hardened to the demands of those farther down the line who were asking for the same privilege for the same reasons. Thus, we find women today, after all classes of men have gained their rights to the franchise, asking for a chance for self-expression for the same reasons

that groups of men in times past have put forth their claims. And, strangely, the same arguments that are raised against the granting of the ballot to women applied equally to granting the ballot to men. Why will the kettle always call the pot black?

In the beginning of government, the power was always vested in one man. These rulers have gone by different titles — chieftain, king, czar, emperor. At the beginning their power was absolute. History of the ages is one long struggle by kings to keep their power and authority intact. Wars were fought at the drop of a sovereign hat and no questions asked; nations were thrust into ruin and oppression by the boasting of a king. Rulers went forth with unchallenged right to wage battle as they saw fit, and the rank and file had no choice but to follow.

The ruler of the Roman Empire held this absolute power; his will was law. Citizens were even obliged to worship him as the deified head of the State. Christians were persecuted, not because of their religious differences, but because they refused to bow down and worship the emperor. Tremendous power was thus bestowed in one person; the power of life and death over his subjects.

During the Middle Ages Europe lay dormant, and there is little to relate in the development of the democratic ideal in government. A great upheaval, however, was in process, and out of the mixture of races during that time we find a firmer foundation

for democracy being laid. Kings still held sway, but groups of people were developing prestige who began to smart under the autocracy of their rulers and now and then showed their displeasure by asking for the right to determine certain things for themselves. They in turn, however, were just as autocratic with the people under their jurisdiction.

The development of democracy in England is perhaps the most interesting to us because we have acquired so many of our laws and institutions from that country. In England we find the first important steps in the direction of representation when the Witan developed as a group of ealdormen, bishops, and court officials who were brought together by the king to consult with him. This group was later to be made the foundation for a sounder representative government, when the Magna Charta was wrested from King John in 1215. This was the culmination of a fight that had been going on for years. Little did these men realize what a fundamental change they were seeking. But once their rights had been recognized, it was never possible to get back on the old footing, or for kings afterwards to evade the Great Charter. There were rulers who were benevolent in their despotism and avoided friction with their people, but there were those in turn who perpetrated abuses of all kinds upon their subjects, and "indirect influence" was of little avail against such as these.

Though the promise of reform was easily obtained from King John, he not only tried to break his agreement, but kings that followed after him also tried to do away with it — without success, however. The adventures of Parliament through the various reigns were hectic. But eventually the right of the people to be represented in governmental affairs became generally recognized, and kings finally gave up trying to break through. Edward IV often forgot to call Parliament annually and also took a free hand in suspending the laws passed when it did meet, and Henry VII was even more careless. The financial straits in which James I found himself during his reign were the only reasons that made him recognize the governing body of the people. Finally, when William and Mary came to the throne, they accepted the Bill of Rights, which took away many of the privileges which former sovereigns had claimed, and secured further the individual rights of Englishmen. From that time onward Parliament, rather than the king, was destined to be the stronger force in English government.

Thus we find the Magna Charta the first great blow struck for human liberty; and though it was only to the very rich and powerful that a voice in the government was granted, it was the beginning of centuries of fighting, by first one group and then another, to be counted as part of the people. It

was also the entering wedge against the doctrine of the divine right of kings.

The property-holding classes and those who held special privileges were content to leave well enough alone. They now had rights for themselves and were little interested in the demands of others. In the upheaval caused by the Black Death and the Peasants' Rebellion, in the middle of the fourteenth century, we find the beginning of the struggle in England between the working classes and the aristocracy of the property-holding classes — a struggle still far from being ended.

The Industrial Revolution brought about changes which had a decided effect upon government representation in England. With the development of machinery and the factory system, great manufacturing towns sprang up, and people who formerly had lived in rural centers crowded into cities. Population shifted and a new group of influential and wealthy citizens was developed. The latter were not satisfied with the old parliamentary representation, because it was out of proportion with the importance of the new centers. Many of them had no representation at all, and the land-holding nobles were not anxious to share their privileges. The House of Lords was composed largely of an hereditary aristocracy. The House of Commons was almost as undemocratic, for the list of towns entitled to representation was the same as in the fifteenth century,

and those voting were the landlords. A small number of men in this way elected a great majority of the members of the House of Commons. Out of England's eight million people, only about one hundred and fifty thousand composed the governing classes.

The French Revolution, with its appeal for liberty, and the Industrial Revolution as well, began to have its effect in England, and the reform of Parliament was one of the first demands made. This meant a demand for a more equal distribution of districts, the extension of the suffrage to the new groups, and other minor changes. A bill was finally introduced, in 1830, embodying the changes desired. It called for the removal of the representation of some fifty-six towns and the reduction of the representation of thirty-one others from two to one. It also struck at the hereditary rights of a small group of people, and it was only after a bitter struggle of two years that its passage was secured.

The masses of the people helped in the fight for the reform bill by holding mass meetings and carrying on a campaign of publicity, although many of them did not directly benefit by the changes. It had seemed to them the beginning of a new régime in government, however, and they hoped that, with the fall of the aristocracy and the rise of democracy, their rights would eventually be secured to them by the new groups which they were helping to en-

franchise. But after these new groups gained their rights, they forgot the laboring masses. The classes from whom the ballot was withheld became discontented, and their demands began to take organized form; the Chartist movement, which bordered on revolution, was the result. The actions of the suffragettes of England have been mild in comparison with the things that the Chartists did in order to bring pressure to bear on Parliament. Universal suffrage, a secret ballot, annual election of Parliament, abolition of property qualifications for membership in Parliament, and the reapportionment of election districts were some of the reforms demanded. Although the Chartist party broke up before its hopes were realized, the Second Reform Bill was passed in 1867 as a result of its agitation.

The principal change through the passage of this bill was the reduction of the property qualifications, so that practically all men in towns gained the franchise, and in the rural districts the farming class secured its rights. This meant that nearly two-thirds of the men were then enfranchised, the only groups left without this right being the farm laborers and those who had no domicile. The living conditions of the farm laborers were deplorable, and the extension of the ballot was advocated in order to give them a means of protecting themselves. They were finally rewarded, in 1884, when the Third Reform Bill was passed, extending the right of

franchise to them and to other smaller groups that had not been included in other measures passed before.

In 1888 Parliament passed an act creating "County Councils," and in 1894 another act was passed creating "Parish Councils." These bills gave over to the people the control of local affairs, women as well as men having a right to be counted. Another Reform Bill is now before Parliament, and among the groups which it is proposed to enfranchise are women over thirty years of age.

The beginning of representative government in France dates back to 1302, when Philip assembled the Estates General to help him in the matter of the collection of taxes. Kings in the past had often consulted the nobles and prelates, but in that year the townspeople were included, so that the body was fairly representative. The king, however, did not yield any of his royal prerogatives, and still claimed the right to levy taxes without the advice of his subjects if he so chose. After that date the Estates General was summoned only at irregular intervals. It did not have the powers that the English Parliament developed, and consequently decades were allowed to pass without its being called into session. Thus the French kings were able to hold for a longer time and more firmly to the idea of God-given rights.

In 1789 the Estates General was again called into

existence, the first time since 1614. It was out of this assembly that the National Assembly was formed and the task of preparing a constitution for France was begun. Sweeping reforms were made, including the abolition of the survivals of feudalism, equalization of taxation, and the abolition of special privileges of all kinds. The Declaration of the Rights of Man was drawn up — a striking statement of fundamental principles of justice and a repudiation of all the abuses that had grown up under the tyranny of kings. In the light of the present demand for the ballot for women, it is interesting to note the doctrine enunciated by the Frenchmen of that era who were inspired by a vital belief in democracy. It laid down the principle that "Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate, personally or through his representative, in its formation. It must be the same for all." Thus began the French Revolution, and many turbulent years passed before France found her footing again. Destined to be a republic, and to fall back again under a most despotic system headed by Napoleon, torn to pieces by war and intrigue, the rights of man were in an unsettled state for many years, until 1876, when a republic was finally established.

In Germany, toward the end of the fifteenth century, the Diet tried to bring harmony among the dozen different states composing the then German

Empire. These little states were presided over by knights, who held the real power, the emperor being merely a figurehead. While the declaration of rights and democracy were being acquired by the masses in other countries, the leaders in Germany were conspiring against progress, and the Thirty Years War was laying waste the nation so that it took it generations to recover. There was no democratic movement in Germany until after the French Revolution, when the seeds of this democracy were sown by the armies of Napoleon.

In 1815 an important meeting of the Diet was held at Frankfort for the purpose of discussing the union, but it was made up of diplomatic representatives of the rulers of the several states involved, and not of the people. The Congress of Vienna was an attempt to turn back the clock of progress, and in 1819 the Carlsbad Resolutions were adopted, checking reforms. But this could not keep the movement from growing, and promises of reform were wrenched from the powers by the middle of the century. They were mere promises, however, for when a great assemblage met in Frankfort in 1848 to draw up a new constitution fitting for a free people, they failed because of the antagonism between Austria and Prussia. An agreement was reached in 1871, when the German Empire was established, giving the people some right to a voice in the government through the establishment of a popular

assembly; but this has proved practically nothing but a debating society, "A Hall of Echoes." A popular voice in the national affairs of Germany is still conditional, and it has never reached the point that it has in England and France; "Divine Guidance" is still claimed by the ruler as a reason for failing to allow the people to rule. Franchise reforms are a pertinent issue in Germany at the present time, and now and then the rumblings of discontent slip by the censor. That the political freedom of the people of this great country may soon be realized is the hope of all lovers of liberty.

The names of Mazzini and Kossuth signify the fight of the people for a voice in the governments of Italy and Austria. These men were the leaders who dared stand out against the old order and instil the spirit of freedom among the peoples of the two countries, where the struggles still continue for the same rights that the women of America are demanding. In Italy the executive power belongs exclusively to the king, and only about one-third of the men of the nation have the right of franchise. The world has been profoundly stirred by what has recently happened in Russia. A complete upheaval has taken place; the shrine of the divine right to rule has been struck down. In its place has been established a socialistic government under the power of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies, thus going a step ahead of any other government in

the history of the world in carrying out a conception of democracy.

Living in a democracy, as we do in America, we fail sometimes to appreciate the fact that the old idea of "divine right" still holds sway over vast groups of people. Although the German and Greek thrones at present seem to be tottering, and the Spanish people are becoming inquisitive, the Emperor of Japan, however, still sits solidly enthroned over the minds as well as the bodies of his subjects; but that he will remain in that comfortable position for a long time cannot be guaranteed. In an interview recently, Count Terauchi, a leading statesman of that country, is reported as saying:

> Our empire is ruled by an unbroken line of emperors, and the relation of sovereigns and subjects determined from the beginning will last forever. It is, however, to be deeply regretted that the atmosphere in our world of current discussion is of late more or less charged with a spirit of careless abandon. There are even people who take pleasure in voicing extreme views. There is even danger of mistaken views being aired concerning the basic principles of our political system, and reflections made derogatory to the dignity of the imperial house.

This may sound like a voice from the dark ages, but it shows that the fight for democracy is a present-day struggle. We decry the theory that certain men were chosen from on high to rule as kings and

mikados over the people, and rejoice that the power of government is shifting to the masses. We likewise claim that the theory that the men have a divine right to rule over the women is also absurd and unjust.

While the European countries were fighting over their problems, a new country was being built up by groups, many of whom came to it in search of freedom from religious and political persecution. But the fact that they were asking freedom for themselves did not always mean that they advocated freedom for others, and we find them, too, acquiring dictatorial habits and imposing their religious and political standards on other groups.

The governors of the colonies held their positions through European appointment. Since land grants were bestowed mainly upon court favorites, and property qualifications were required for voting in practically all of the territory during the Colonial period, the majority had no representation. The King and Parliament were continually interfering in the administration of the affairs of the colonies, at the same time allowing them no representation in Parliament, and calling upon them to pay taxes without allowing them a voice in determining what these should be. The colonies finally rebelled at this injustice, proclaiming that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and that taxation without representation is tyranny.

After the new republic had been established, there was still a property qualification in many states, and among those who were disqualified from the right to the vote because they did not own land were merchants and manufacturers as well as the working classes. They began to campaign for the removal of restrictions, and many of the same arguments that are advanced today against woman suffrage were used then. In New York only those could vote who owned land worth five hundred dollars. It was as late as 1821 and 1826 before action was finally taken enfranchising all men regardless of their economic standing. History is repeating itself, and in 1917 many of those who, had they lived one hundred years ago, would themselves not have been allowed to vote, are throwing their influence against the next group demanding the franchise — the women.

Through the ages and in all countries, religion has played an important part in the politics of the nations. Wars have been waged, kings dethroned, and great masses of people persecuted, because of their religious beliefs. It is, therefore, natural that at times only conformists to the religion of the church in power should have been granted political rights. Little by little, as the idea of autocracy broke down and the right of the people to govern themselves was built up, religious creeds as a qualification to voting were cast off. During the Middle

Ages, when all governments were unsettled, the Church of Rome began to attain political control. There was constant fighting and struggling among the states and the power of the kings everywhere was weak; on the other hand, the Church had built up a strong organization which began to acquire importance as a political factor. Power and command are seldom surrendered willingly, so the Church used its powers to keep political control. After the Reformation, however, nation after nation began to throw off the yoke.

With the establishment of the Church of England, the power of religious persecution changed hands, and the bishops and others who now held sway were scarcely more tolerant than their own persecutors had been. During the latter half of the seventeenth century a series of acts were passed depriving dissenters of the right to hold certain offices. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that Roman Catholics and dissenters were given the right to sit in Parliament and hold public office. The persecution of the Jew in Russia, and the political restrictions placed upon him in that country up to the time of the establishment of the new order there, is a modern illustration of the survival of a prejudice through many ages.

Nor has America always been free from religious persecution — our forefathers brought many of their religious prejudices with them when they came here.

Quakers in some places held that they alone should vote; Puritans demanded the banishment of non-believers; Rhode Island was founded by people who were driven from Massachusetts because of their religious beliefs, many of them being exiled from the latter place. In some states certain sects were discriminated against, and thus we find New York and Massachusetts excluding the Catholics from the franchise; in the majority of the colonies the Baptists and the Jews were not allowed to vote. These prejudices were all removed, however, when the colonies united.

Race, as well as religion, has kept groups from voting, but this prejudice, too, has been overcome to a great extent. The Civil War established the rights of people in America regardless of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." "No man is good enough to govern another without that other man's consent," said Abraham Lincoln, and believing in this principle so far as the question of the black race was concerned, the United States Government not alone emancipated the Negro, but gave him the right to vote.

Women were among the foremost advocates of the freedom of the black man. When Lucretia Mott and Mrs. Wendell Phillips, two earnest workers in the Negro cause, presented their credentials at the Anti-Slavery Convention in London in June, 1840, they were refused the right to attend as delegates

because they were women, revealing the curious manner in which the male mind sometimes works. Women worked earnestly throughout the whole struggle for the freedom of the colored race, and when their leaders drew attention to the similarity of the demands of the women and the Negro, they were asked to stand back, for it was the black man's hour. The women have been waiting ever since for their hour to strike.

The Indians, too, have been enfranchised, as Congress has, by special act, given the vote to tribe after tribe. Like every other group, they have failed to appreciate the position of those less favored than they, and in the last campaign waged by the women of South Dakota the vote of the Indians against the amendment was a potent factor in depriving the women of that state of the ballot.

The right of kings and emperors to cast the vote for all has been challenged; race and religion as qualifications for citizenship have been cast aside as unwarranted prejudices. Likewise the sex line must no longer be drawn, for if we are to have the world democracy we have been hearing so much about of late, it must be a democracy in fact as well as in name. It can never truly be said that the United States is a democracy until the women are granted the right to the ballot.

# CHAPTER IV

## THE MEANING OF WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

THE basic argument for woman suffrage is the argument — old as human progress — on which every extension of the franchise has been based: namely, the right of the people to govern themselves. In undertaking to give the arguments in favor of the enfranchisement of women, we need merely to take those that have been advanced by various groups of men in the past and apply them to women. Likewise, the arguments that may be raised against the extension of the franchise to this group are practically the same as those that have been used against the extension of the suffrage to men.

There always have been, and presumably always will be, people who believe in special privilege. There are those who advocate government under a benevolent despot as being better than a government of the people. For such as these there is nothing inconsistent in claiming a special sex privilege in governmental affairs, as a despot can be a sex as well as an individual or a class. There are those in whom class loyalty is stronger than sex

loyalty; so the demand for the franchise has many staunch opponents among the women. But, generally speaking, the people who believe in democracy, who believe in bringing the "uncommon good to the common man," those who are leading in the struggles for the advancement of the masses and for the upbuilding of our political life are leaders in the demand for the franchise for women.

Two fundamental principles are laid down by the founders of this government. They are truths that we have known since childhood, yet we seemingly fail to realize their meaning. We proclaim that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that taxation without representation is tyranny. But is this true in America? How can it be when one-half of the people are disfranchised for no other reason than sex? Can it truly be a just government so long as such discriminations are made and women are never given a chance to express their consent? Women are called upon to obey the laws, to pay taxes, and bear the burdens of government; but they have no right in most of the states to say who shall make the laws, who shall enforce them, or in what way their money paid in through taxes shall be spent.

We have held up to all the world that America was the land of freedom; we have promised liberty to all people, and heralded this as a country where

the individual had a chance to show his worth and where all counted equally; we have pointed with pride to the fact that this was the great melting pot of the world; so people have flocked to our shores. They have come to us from India, from England, from the far lands of Russia and Africa; we have attracted the German and the Frenchman, the Jew and the Gentile, and have offered them all opportunities of citizenship. Holding up these ideals of fundamental justice with one arm, the nation, with its other, has held back one-half of its citizens and refused to allow them to vote merely because they were women. The Statue of Liberty in the form of a woman holds up the beacon light in our greatest harbor; it is a woman who has been chosen to represent the spirit of political freedom; but the nation has failed to put its ideals wholly into practise.

No other group that has ever been enfranchised was so well fitted to undertake the responsibilities of voting as the women of America are today. As a result of the years of toiling, organizing, educating, and fighting for the ballot, they stand admirably equipped for public service. They have learned a wonderful lesson through their organized campaign which will serve well the body politic after the ballot is granted. Those who are opposing the suffrage have also learned — though perhaps unconsciously — their lesson in cooperation and unity of effort which will serve a good purpose when their fears

are proven baseless and they assume their political responsibilities.

In demanding the ballot women are asking to have their opinions count as half of the people and in the most direct way possible, for the ballot is the best way yet devised by the human brain as the means of representing the will of the people. It is no mad desire on the part of women to put a piece of paper in the ballot box or push the buttons on a voting machine. It is not the vote only that they seek, but what the ballot means — that bit of personal freedom for which men have been fighting for all these many generations: the moral, mental, economic, and spiritual enfranchisement which political enfranchisement would help bring to pass.

No one person can represent another. Likewise, no one sex can represent another. Men can no more represent women than women could represent men. We would scorn the idea that the Swede could represent the Irishman, the farmer the banker, or the Jew the Christian. If group representation were better, sons would beseech their fathers to represent them as well as the women of the family, and with one accord they would flock to the proper office seeking to be disfranchised. All admit the fallacy of saying that any of these groups could be adequately represented by the other, and yet many throw logic to the winds and argue that men can represent women. It is a time-old saying that "If

there is one thing a man can never understand it is a woman," but still he persists in trying to represent her in government.

The Czar of Russia thought he represented the people better than they knew how to represent themselves, but to his sorrow he finally found out, in a most forcible manner, that this was not the kind of representation that they wanted. Neither is it the kind of representation that the women want. They wish to have their opinions count directly, and there is no reason why this should interfere with their indirect influence any more than it does with man's. It would not take the women any longer than it does the men to vote, and their homes would not be neglected any more than men's business is neglected by their going to the polls.

It is often charged that the polls are not fit places for women. This is an indictment against the ability of man to carry on the business of government and not an argument against women suffrage. Politics is science of government. Every effort to hinder the interest of any group in public affairs by saying that politics is too dirty to mix in, is a blow to good government and an obstruction placed in the way of political progress.

Not only would the women be able to make their opinion count directly through the ballot box, but they would have greater influence because of the potential power of the ballot. Politicians would be

more conscious of the interests of women if they were enfranchised. We know from experience that those in office are particularly sensitive to the wants of their constituents. Even if the women did not always vote after gaining the ballot, those in office would be aware of the fact that there would always be the possibility of their rising up and registering their opinions in a manner that would count. We know how the men in office watch out for the "labor vote," the "Southern vote," and the "farmer vote," although it is rarely that these groups can be delivered in toto; nevertheless, the potential power that they have, the possibility of their rising up and expressing themselves as a whole, has a very decided effect upon the way their interests are cared for in legislative halls. So with the women. Many women might not use the ballot if it were given them. It would be absurd to try and guarantee beforehand how many would vote or how they would vote, but those in office would be slow to tamper with matters in which women in general were interested, because of the possibility of their waking up and registering their opinions. If the ballot were given women, there would be the possibility of their rising at any time; and this would insure better protection than to have women voteless, even though they did not all use it.

The experiences in the state where women vote have been the same. Measures for which the women

worked before they were enfranchised were passed by legislatures that had formerly opposed them. The legislators knew that they were directly responsible to the women, and although the women had as yet no opportunity to express themselves at the polls, the men realized that it was best not to go contrary to the will of the feminine element.

In Chicago public-spirited women had been working for many years for women on the police force, but to no avail. Immediately after the ballot was granted them, and before they had even had an opportunity to vote, those in authority called their representatives into a conference, found what their desires were, and granted the request. Why? The women had not helped elect those men; they had not even shown, through registering, whether they were going to vote at the next election; but the politicians recognized the potential power of the women's ballots; they realized that they were responsible to a new group of people who held the power of direct representation, and they bowed to their demands.

A vote means power. It gives authority. It makes the humblest person equal in one respect to the greatest. It is the most valuable thing that a citizen has, because it guarantees his rights as a sovereign. It is the way man has of conserving his interests. The man who has no vote is a political nonentity. So with the woman. Women should

have the ballot because of its direct benefits, because of its potential power and effect, not alone upon those who represent her, but upon herself. She should have the ballot so that when she awakens, the means will be at her command by which she can express herself.

For one thing, woman needs the ballot for the protection of the home. This may seem like a singular statement to those who have been arguing that "woman's place is in the home," and that, therefore, she has no need for the ballot. The anomaly lies in the difference of interpretation as to what are the boundary lines of the home, and the meaning of politics.

Politics, in the broader and better sense, means government — the making of rules and regulations for all to live by. More and more, governments are concerning themselves with matters relating to civic and social betterment, and these are the things in which women are interested. New methods and new standards are needed to meet the changing conditions; the old political formulas do not fit the modern problems, and we must face the issues in order to see in what way women's lives are changed and affected.

It is ludicrous to claim that politics is foreign and apart from the home when one realizes that politics is government, and that the home and government have a hundred and one points of contact. More

and more, governmental agencies are directing the affairs of women; more and more, the homes are being drawn into politics. Mothers are finding that it is not enough to prepare the children for the world, but they must, if they are to do their duty by them, help to prepare the world for the children. Women are getting acutely interested in public questions to which they were formerly indifferent. It is beginning to dawn upon the consciousness of every woman that her little world is part of the world at large, and that the solution of her problems lies in the solution of community problems. She is beginning to realize that the price of her dinner is voted up and down at election time; that safety of the lives of her children from disease is now a political matter; that the moral conditions surrounding her boy and her girl, when they step from the home into the outer world, are matters controlled by the ballot. How can anyone imagine that she would be willing to remain peacefully at home, unmindful of her duty toward her children? Can anyone imagine that, with the education and awakening of the modern woman, she would go along without interest in community affairs, even if she has no children to be cared for? She has been taught to read and write, the natural result of which is to think; therefore, it is logical that she should demand the most simple and direct method of having her voice count in the solution of these problems.

It is idle to say to the average woman of today, "Your place is within the four walls of your house." It may be admitted that woman's sphere could be thus defined in the days when everything was made at home, and the housewife held control of all the forces affecting her dominion; but with the changed economic conditions the home also has changed, and for her own protection she too must have a voice and a hand in determining the problems which so decidedly affect the welfare of those she holds most dear. We are reminded by those opposing suffrage that there are still problems of the hearthstone to be solved; that when the domestic-servant problem is solved, and not till then, has a woman any right to ask to take a hand in affairs outside the home. Those of the opposition fail to see that the home conditions have changed, and that the small proportion who have domestics cannot solve their problem separate and apart from the general community and labor problems.

From the time she gets up in the morning until she goes to bed at night, the average woman is brought in close touch with the machinery of government. In the morning, she turns on the gas or electricity, and comes in contact with the problem of regulation of public utilities; she takes the milk from the ice box, and faces the question of the enforcement of milk inspection; she fries meat, the sweetness of which depends upon the meat inspec-

tors; she turns on the water faucet, which may mean contagion and spread of typhoid fever if the officials are lacking in thoroughness; she labors long and hard to sweep out the dirt tracked in from streets which are not properly cared for by the street-cleaning department; the children come home sick from school, stricken by the spread of a contagious disease through the carelessness of the health department; she goes shopping, and pays an extra price because of the tariff; and so on through the day. At every turn she is confronted by practical politics. And yet, in the face of innumerable daily incidents, it is maintained with incomprehensible bigotry that an interest in politics is incompatible with the welfare of the home.

During the winter of 1916-17, when food prices rose to unprecedented heights, the cost of living was a topic of conversation at every corner grocery and every fireside throughout the country. In the crowded tenement districts of some of the larger cities, it took on a more serious aspect. In these sections lived people who could not see onions and potatoes rise a few cents a pound without feeling the pinch that borders on hunger. In New York City the distress found expression in food riots. Then the mayor of that great city was visited by a throng of tenement mothers, who called upon him to do something in order that their children should not starve. He told them that the

solution of the problem lay within the power of the legislature and for them to go to Albany. Thus, in the twentieth century, the solution of the food problem lay, not within the four walls of the home, not within the power of the women to control, but in the hands of men who secured their power through votes. Thousands of women were rudely awakened that winter to the realization that their time-old field of endeavor was broken and a new force had come into their homes. If one were to tell those women that they could keep the home without reference to outside influence, they would say that facts and experience have taught them otherwise.

Women are inclined to look at matters from an entirely different standpoint from the men. The home and children have been their especial interest, and will continue to be; man's has been business, and he has turned his attention to legislation affecting property largely. A very striking illustration of this is a comparison of the amount appropriated by Congress for the Children's Bureau, with appropriations for other things. It is because men look at things from a business standpoint that Congress will appropriate $600,000 for the prevention of hog cholera, and at the same session appropriate only $164,265 for the bureau which is created to look after the welfare of all the children of the United States. It is approbatory that the diseases of ani-

mals should be looked after, but the well-being of children should not be secondary.

From birth until death, politics plays an important part in woman's life. Her birth must be registered according to law; she is taken from her home at a given age and forced to go to school under compulsory education legislation; she cannot marry until the law has been complied with and a marriage license secured. When she and her husband decide to establish a home, they find they cannot build until the approval of certain municipal officials is obtained; when her children are ill with contagious diseases, the Health Department compels her to obey its rules; and, finally, when she dies, the law has its last rules and regulations to be complied with.

The real situation confronting women was shown at a meeting when the proposed health-insurance act was being explained to the League of Tenement Mothers' Clubs, an organ representing about two thousand women who live in the tenement districts of New York City. An expert from one of the large insurance companies told of the benefits that would accrue to the men and working women under the act in case it became a law. After he had finished, a woman who was the mother of six children arose and asked why no provision had been made for the women in the homes, and he replied that it was because their services had no economic value. "But you tell us that the mothers and house-

keepers are the corner-stone of society; then why don't you help us equally with the women who work outside the home?" she queried. He had no answer, and his silence was significant. Society is refusing to face the situation and sentiment is having its play; in the meantime the women who guard the welfare of the home are left without. The control of old has been taken from them and they have not been provided with modern weapons with which to fight their battles. The home must be directly represented in politics or it will continue to suffer.

No argument for woman suffrage would be complete without drawing attention to the needs of that great group of women who are working outside of the home. There are over eight million women in this group, and their welfare is very largely affected by political conditions. The old method of individual bargaining has passed with the arrival of modern industrial conditions. Legislatures are determining the number of hours that women shall labor, are regulating sanitary conditions surrounding them at their toil, are providing for fire protection, and, under minimum wage legislation, are determining the amount of pay that they shall receive. Justice demands that women employes shall have a voice as well as the employers in the election of the men who are going to determine these matters.

The ballot has proved a great boon to the laboring man, and like means of self-protection should be given to the laboring woman. It is true that it has not solved all the problems of the industrial world for the working man, but it has made a vast difference to the labor unions and other organizations struggling for better industrial standards to have the power of the ballot back of their demands. Likewise it would be an aid to the women who are fighting to protect themselves through legislation, not alone in securing the passage of laws but in making them effective by proper enforcement.

As legislatures more and more take over the right to solve industrial problems through legislation, the reason for women voting is made imperative. The welfare of women in industry is a grave and momentous social problem. The average number of years spent by women in industry is seven, according to the estimates of experts in this field. If women are not properly protected, if no thought is taken of their welfare during these years, society must pay the penalty, for these women leave the industrial world to become the mothers of the future generations, and if they have been overworked and underfed, it means that society will suffer in the end by such a stupid and short-sighted public policy.

The problem of women in industry is not one to be lightly dealt with. It deserves serious consideration because of the wide-spread effect that it has

upon social standards. Almost every industry has been invaded by women as a result of the economic changes affecting the home. The solution lies in justice, not in charity; and justice demands that these women be given the power to help themselves and have a voice in controlling the conditions surrounding them. Women are sitting at power machines making thirty-five hundred stitches a minute; they are working in hot and steaming laundries making sixty-three to eighty-one foot pressures a minute, causing an unnatural twist of the body with every pressure; women in the textile mills are straining under the necessity of watching from sixteen to twenty-five bobbins, charged with the responsibility of seeing that nothing goes wrong; they are working at telephone switchboards under a tremendous nervous strain; carrying loaded trays in restaurants; scrubbing on hands and knees in offices; cutting meat in packing houses; and so on through the innumerable fields into which industry is divided, you will find women working, and working almost invariably under heavy strain, long hours and at a low wage. It is not a question of taking them out of industry: the problem is one of turning drudgery into suitable labor.

Working women organized through the National Women's Trade Union League are asking for the ballot. They realize that they are handicapped in their demands for better conditions of labor because

they are deprived of it. They know that the only states that have an eight-hour law for working women are states where women vote: Colorado, California, Washington, Wyoming, Oregon, and Arizona. They know that men have been able to secure sixty-eight laws in twenty-eight states providing for an eight-hour law in certain occupations. They know that their wages are below a living standard because their economic status is largely affected by their political status. They know that fire-trap buildings, immoral conditions in the streets, bad housing, sanitary control, are all political issues. Having first-hand knowledge of the difficulties arising from the sudden throwing of women into the industrial world, they are conscious of the need of the ballot as a means of self-protection.

Thus we have the women, in the home and out, needing the ballot. The longer it is withheld, the greater will be the social loss. It is true that not all of the women of these groups are joining in the demand for a change, but it must be taken into consideration that many of them have not the chance to express themselves. It is true that only a relatively small number are making objections, if reference is made only to those who are making an articulate demand; but that the great majority desire the change is shown in every canvass that has been taken. Perhaps no states have done the house-to-house canvassing more thoroughly than Ne

York and Ohio, and in both of these the results were overwhelmingly in favor of suffrage.

It is the ballot in a democracy that makes public opinion effective. It is imperative that women should have the chance to express themselves now when their interests are so keenly affected by politics, when issues such as the great war have burdened the country with must be faced, and since the three great crimes of poverty, ignorance, and disease are cured to a great extent through legislation. Women have answered the call to social service, and are asking to be placed in a position to be of greatest help. With the signs of the times pointing to greater socialistic control, it is imperative that all social forces be developed to their widest extent, as society can rise no higher than its masses, which are composed of women as well as of men.

# CHAPTER V

## PROGRESS OF THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT

HARDLY a month passes without some substantial victory recorded for woman suffrage. The world is afire with suffrage sentiment, and those who hold within their grasp the power to give women the right to the ballot are yielding to the demand. From Russia, from England, from Ohio, and far-off islands of the sea, with the sweep of democracy throughout the world comes the news of victory for the women — the recognition of their right to be counted as part of the people, and the opportunity accorded them to express their opinions in a direct manner.

The barriers are fast breaking down and old opposition is slinking away. There is perhaps no better proof of the justification of the right of women to vote than the spread of the movement. In the United States, state after state is falling into line, either through a referendum granting full suffrage to women, or through legislative enactment granting presidential suffrage.

The first demand for the ballot was made in 1776, when Mrs. Abigail Adams wrote to John Adams, her

husband, when he was a member of the Continental Congress, and asked him to "remember the ladies" when planning for the new government. Nearly a century passed before a legislative body in the United States heeded this request.

In 1869 Wyoming, a territory, then on the frontier, gave women the right to vote in order to help keep law and order. When, in 1890, Wyoming was asking to be admitted as a state, objection was made in Congress to allowing the women to vote. The usual dire prophecies were made with regard to what would happen if women continued to have the ballot. The men of Wyoming stood by their colors, convinced that woman suffrage had proved a good thing for the state, and they sent a message to Congress saying that they would remain out of the Union a hundred years rather than come in without the women. Congress was obliged to leave the right for women to vote in the Wyoming constitution, and since then suffrage has spread throughout the West and is gradually creeping into the East.

The men of Colorado looked across the border and saw that the vote of the women in Wyoming had a steadying effect, and so a law was passed in 1893 giving the women of that state the right to vote. Ten years later this right was written into the constitution of the state, for women had proved their ability to share with the men the right of self-government.

In 1896 Utah and Idaho granted the franchise to the women. Thus ends the first chapter in the progress of woman suffrage in America, because it was fourteen years before another state was added to the suffrage map. The suffrage amendment carried in the state of Washington in 1910, every county in the state casting a majority in favor of women's voting. The next year a most decisive victory was won when California joined the suffrage ranks. This had a great influence in the East, and also in political circles, because of the number of electoral votes that the state had in the national college. Tourists from the East returning home from California carried the glad tidings that women still were women even after casting their ballots; that the homes still stood on solid foundations; and that men and women were still marrying and loving one another. Could it be that, after all, the bugaboos set up against women voting were false? At last the light began to dawn.

Oregon still remained a dark spot on the Pacific Coast, but in 1912 there was great rejoicing when not only Oregon, but Arizona and Kansas joined the group of suffrage states. Kansas had had municipal woman suffrage since 1887, so the further extension of the right to vote was not surprising.

Another chapter in suffrage progress begins with 1913, when Illinois, by legislative enactment, gave the women the right to vote for all offices not men-

tioned in the state constitution, thereby not requiring the submission of a constitutional amendment. In Illinois this included all municipal officials, some county and state officials, and the president of the United States. In order to have complete suffrage, an amendment will have to be submitted and carried by a majoriy vote of the men of the state. In 1914 Nevada and Montana carried constitutional amendments granting suffrage to women, and the legislature in Alaska gave the same right to the women living in that territory. In 1917 the following state legislatures gave presidential suffrage to the women: Ohio, Michigan, Rhode Island, North Dakota, Indiana, and Nebraska, and Arkansas gave the women the right to vote at the primaries.

In a number of states suffrage amendments have been submitted and defeated. These can hardly be considered defeats for suffrage because there is no case on record when woman suffrage has been repealed after once having been granted, and though amendments may have been lost, the gains in every case have been substantial. When the first suffrage amendment was submitted in Michigan, in 1874, 40,077 votes were cast in favor; in 1913, although defeated, the number was raised to 168,738 favorable votes. In Nebraska, in 1871, there were 3,502 votes for suffrage; in 1882, 25,756; and in 1914, 90,738. In Ohio, in 1912, there were 249,420 votes cast in favor of the amendment; in 1914, 335,390.

In South Dakota, in 1890, there were 22,792 votes cast in favor of the amendment; in 1898, 19,698; and in 1914, 39,605. In other states, when an amendment has been submitted and lost, there has been no previous record with which to compare it; but experience has shown that a vote once cast in favor of suffrage, is a permanent gain, and that it was only a question of time until minorities became majorities. Washington, Oregon, and California did not grant woman suffrage the first time an amendment was submitted; but now, having granted the ballot, the testimony from those states is overwhelmingly in favor of the new order.

As has already been shown, the woman movement is world-wide, so the demand for the conquest of the ballot is not limited to the United States. The same unrest, too, has been expressed in far-off countries, though in perhaps a different way. In the countries where the progress of democracy has been greatest, the woman movement has met the greatest success. A comparison of the countries shows that where civilization has reached the highest mark, it will be found that woman has most freedom, and in the most backward countries the restrictions thrown about her are most binding.

Unmarried women and widows have had municipal suffrage in England and Wales since 1869. In Scotland and in Ireland women have the same rights as men in municipal affairs. The right to vote in

national affairs—a right for which the women of Great Britain have been fighting for many years—has been promised by the government as a result of their work during the present war. Under the bill as it has passed the third reading in the House of Commons, no woman can vote until she is thirty years of age, and the women who are enfranchised are limited to university electors, local government electors, and the wives of voters. This will give the vote to about six million women. Although it does not mean that women will have suffrage on the same basis as men, it does mean an opening wedge and but a short time until equality shall be realized.

The Isle of Man gave full suffrage to women property owners in 1881, and to all women taxpayers in 1892; New Zealand gave full suffrage to women in 1893, and in 1901 full suffrage was granted to the women of Australia. Canada began its experiment with woman suffrage in 1884 when municipal suffrage was granted to widows and unmarried women who owned property; but during the last two years complete suffrage has been given the women in seven out of eight provinces.

Finland granted full suffrage to women in 1906, and since then the women have taken a prominent part in the government of that country, a number of women having been elected to the national parliament. The Scandinavian countries, too, have been among the first to recognize women. Sweden ex-

tended the first franchise rights to women in 1862 by giving the municipal vote to taxpaying women, and has gradually extended the right until, in 1909, the municipal vote was given to all women, while the taxpaying women of Norway have had full suffrage since 1907, and in 1913 the right was extended to all women. Iceland gave its women full suffrage in 1913, and two years later Denmark came into the full suffrage ranks after having tried municipal suffrage for some time.

In 1908 the women of Germany and Austria for the first time were given the right to form political organizations, and since then suffrage associations have been formed. In Italy, too, the ban on women's organizations has been relaxed, so that the women of southern Europe are beginning to raise their voices. We are too inclined to think of the suffrage movement as affecting women in America alone without realizing how widespread the demand is; but the fact that twenty-six national suffrage associations belong to the International Woman Suffrage Alliance speaks for itself. And still there are those who affirm that suffrage sentiment is on a decline!

"This rehearsal of the progress of woman suffrage may be true, but what has been accomplished?" we are asked. "Why follow the same paths unless there is something to show for it?" It must be remembered that women have been voting but a short time; that reforms in government

are not accomplished in a day; and that public sentiment is slow to change. The one great thing accomplished is that it places women in a position to grow, for growth comes with the chance for self-expression. Women are realizing for the first time that they are part of the people and have a responsibility toward society in the way in which they acquit themselves, and responsibility broadens people. It is not through cloistered innocence that great personalities can be developed: it is through responsibility and contact with the world, and a realization that one's acts reflect to the credit or detriment of the whole. Women are learning this through the use of the ballot. It is developing a social consciousness in them. It is taking them out of their small selves into a bigger conception of life and its meanings and values.

There also has grown up in the suffrage states a different attitude toward women on the part of men. They are no longer on a different footing: they are partners. Men recognize in women their equal, and a spirit of comradeship has developed. The ballot means power, and men know it. Their respect for women equipped with this additional power is noticeable in the manner in which they treat women.

Also, legislation is beginning to reflect the interests of women. It is only natural that matters pertaining to the home, children, school, and such interests would first challenge the attention of women.

The laws relating to women and children in the suffrage states have improved with the entrance of women into the political life of the state. There is still room for improvements, of course, and no one is more fully aware of this than those who are working for the betterment of these laws.

In considering this phase of the question — the comparison of the laws for women in woman-suffrage and male-suffrage states — it is not fair to take the best laws of the non-suffrage states and compare with the poorest laws in the suffrage states, or vice versa, as it is only by averages that a comparison may be made. Only twelve suffrage states are counted in the following comparisons, for in the newly enfranchised states suffrage has not had a chance to affect legislation because of the fact that no elections have yet been held since they became part of the electorate.

All of the full suffrage states have compulsory education laws. Compare this record with Texas, Virginia, Georgia, and some of the other states that pride themselves on keeping women in their proper sphere! In four of the suffrage states, and for special industries in two others, eight-hour laws for working women have been passed. No male-suffrage state has as yet enacted such legislation, though many have eight-hour laws protecting men in public service and other specified trades. Seven suffrage states have minimum wage laws as com-

pared to five male-suffrage states. Idaho and Wyoming have been criticized for not having better labor laws for women, and they are compared by those opposing suffrage with New York, Massachusetts, and other states where women do not vote, to show that the ballot does not help the working women; but such a comparison is not a fair one when one takes into consideration the fact that Idaho and Wyoming are not manufacturing states, and that the number of women in industry is negligible.

Widowed mothers' pensions are in force in all of the suffrage states, as compared with less than half of the states where men alone vote. In eleven of the suffrage states, mothers and fathers are equal guardians over their children. In twenty-five of the male-suffrage states the father is the sole guardian; in several he may give away the children without the mother's consent. The age of consent has been raised to eighteen years in all but two of the suffrage states, but only eight of the male-suffrage states have acquired this standard, and in two the limit is as low as ten years. Every equal-suffrage state has a law against pandering, while eight of the male-suffrage states have none. In nine suffrage states Red Light Abatement and Injunction laws have been passed for the control of commercialized vice, as compared with sixteen of the states where women have not been enfranchised. The Interparliamentary Union at London declares that Colorado has

"the sanest, most humane, most progressive, most scientific laws relating to the child to be found on any statute books in the world."

Many of the male-suffrage states have splendid laws for the protection of women and children, but we must remember what group has fought to get this legislation and used its indirect influence almost to the breaking point. From the beginning it has been the suffragists who have worked unceasingly for these reforms, and it has been their practical experience in securing legislation that has made them believe in the power of the ballot.

The influence of the women in politics has been felt in other ways than in legislative reform. Schoolhouses and grocery stores have become the polling places instead of saloons and livery stables, with the consequent lessening of the influence of the latter. In Chicago a great awakening of civic interest among the people followed the conferring of the vote upon women. A $2,000,000 appropriation for a long-needed improvement in the garbage disposal system received immediate approval, although previously withheld for many years; and many appeals for help in cleaning up the slums which had been turned down by the municipal authorities were given consideration after women got the vote. In Chicago the women also organized schools for voters, and men as well as women attended in order to receive instruction in the fundamentals of gov-

ernment. Whoever heard of a newly enfranchised group of men organizing study classes for the purpose of fitting themselves for the responsibilities of citizenship!

At the first legislative session in California after women were granted the ballot, a great number of laws were passed which the women had been trying for a long time to have enacted, such as raising the age of consent, joint guardianship law, stricter child labor laws, illegitimacy law amendments, establishment of a state training school for girls, and other moral reforms. Women's interests were reflected in the passage of these measures. Similar instances could be given for every state where suffrage has been granted. It is the natural result of bringing into the electorate a group representing another point of view.

A practical illustration of the effect of women in politics was shown when the suffragists acted as watchers at the polls in New York, November 2, 1915. That the effect was a desirable one is shown by the following statement from the *Brooklyn Eagle* on election night of that year:

Police Captain William A. Coleman's personal opinion is that the presence of women watchers at the polls is beneficial. Capt. Coleman is in charge of the Adams Street precinct, which has within its boundaries some of the rough parts of the First and Second Assembly districts. He returned at about noon from a tour of the

voting places in his precinct and was enthusiastic over the general orderliness of the voting.

"I was just speaking with two of my sergeants who have been over the ground too," he said, "and they agreed with me that it is good for men to have women watchers at the polls. There is absolutely no disorder today. It is wonderful in the light of the past performances at the polls. There is no loud talk, no vicious talk and very little smoking. The air used to be blue from tobacco smoke. The change is marvelous."

The argument that the home and the children will suffer when the ballot is granted is punctured by facts and the practical working out of woman suffrage. New Zealand shows the lowest infant death rate of any of the nations, having a rate of 51 per 1,000 births. Norway and Australia rank next, and in these countries, also, women vote. In all of the countries having a lower infant mortality rate than the United States, women have at least municipal suffrage. In the United States, California has the highest birth rate and a very low death rate, and women vote in California. This is not happenstance. There is a reason back of it. Most babies die of preventable diseases. The death rate is higher in the sections where the living conditions are worst, the housing conditions bad, and where the crowding is greatest. One out of every six babies in poor homes dies in its first year on account of increased high cost of living which the low wages of the father and mother are unable to meet, according to Miss

Julia Lathrop of the Children's Bureau at Washington. These are the problems that women are most interested in, and in the countries where they have had a voice in politics for any length of time they have made some progress in the solution of them. The results show directly in better living conditions and the preservation of life. As women give life, it is only natural they should protect it.

No movement which was fundamentally wrong, as those who are opposing suffrage claim it to be, could possibly have acquired the prestige that the suffrage movement has gained among women's organizations. The General Federation of Women's Clubs has endorsed it; so have the National Grange, which represents the farm women; the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the International Council of Nurses and the American Nurses' Association, the Women's Trade Union League, and the National Educational Association. These women have endorsed the movement because results in the places where suffrage has been tried warrant its further extension; because they know that the interests which they represent will be better protected when women have the ballot; and because they believe in fundamental justice and have faith in their sex.

---

NOTE:—At the November election (1917), New York passed into the ranks of the suffrage states.—ED.

# CHAPTER VI

## OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

THE opposition to woman suffrage may be classed under three general heads: Lack of belief in democracy, constitutional opposition to a change of any kind, and want of confidence in women. We have already considered suffrage as a part of the great democratic movement. Under the other two headings may be arrayed all of the objections, varying as they do from time to time as one by one the old favorites vanish into mist as time and experience prove their fallacy.

At first the argument was advanced that women did not have the brain capacity; but time has shown that there does not seem to be anything organically wrong with the female species in this respect. Next it was claimed they did not want the vote; but with practically all of the women's organizations of the country standing forth asking for the ballot, and women of every description numbering into the thousands arrayed in the ranks of the various suffrage organizations, with two hundred thousand women actually working in the New York campaign in 1915, this argument, too, has joined the scrap

heap. It used to be said that women would not vote if they had the ballot; but this argument also has become vapid in the face of facts secured from the many places where woman suffrage is a reality, which show that the percentage ranges from fifty-five per cent voting in Finland to as high as ninety per cent in some of the western states.

Every demand for a change meets opposition; consequently it is not strange that the petition for the franchise on the part of the women has met opposition. There are those so constituted mentally that they are always looking backward. They cheerfully accept the advantages gained by those who fought for them in the generations preceding, while constantly blocking progressive measures being advocated by those in the present who have creative vision. Those who are fighting against woman suffrage today generally believe in woman's right to an education; yet if they had lived at the time of Lucy Stone, they undoubtedly would have been found in the ranks of those who doubted the wisdom of woman's encroaching upon man's prerogative in that respect. They acknowledge woman's right to organize; but if perchance they had been of Anne Hutchinson's generation, they, too, would have held up their hands and asked to have that awful woman banished from the community. They play a part, however, in the general scheme of things, for they are a wonderful stimulus in goading on the slackers

in the suffrage ranks whose consciences might otherwise be too easily lulled to inaction.

Other stock arguments that have fear as their basis are, that it would corrupt women to get into politics and that it would break up the homes; also that it would increase divorce because women would differ from their husbands in political matters—though this argument is rarely used by those who argue that the wives would all vote like their husbands, and, therefore, would only double the vote without affecting the results of the election. This fear of woman's corruption through political activity comes from a misunderstanding as to what politics is. Politics to the suffragist means government—the making of rules and regulations for community welfare and the enforcement of these rules. Women are already in the fray as they are part of the community, and why it should corrupt them to deal directly with these matters instead of indirectly is beyond the conception of the mind of a woman suffragist.

The home has not seemed to suffer in the states where women vote; on the contrary, the home is being protected as never before, now that those who are most interested in its welfare are having a direct voice in politics. Children are being safeguarded and the protection of the state thrown about them—a direct result of the mother's interest in public affairs. Although a great deal has been said about

woman suffrage and divorce, the court records in the suffrage states have been gone over most thoroughly, but without finding a case on record where political differences between husband and wife have been the cause for divorce.

One by one, as the evidence comes piling in, these fears are found to be groundless. Woman suffrage is a fact in many places. It is not as though the women were asking for something new and untried. All that one has to do is to examine the evidence that comes from the suffrage states. While it is not all that we might wish it, nevertheless it shows none of the glaring flaws that the opposition prophesied.

For those who fear a change, the skirts of the chivalry argument are always the first place of refuge. As great harm is done to men as to women in assuming this attitude. The suffragists have no quarrel with the men when they say that men cannot represent them — they are not man-haters; in fact, most suffragists will admit that the men have done as well as could be expected in handling governmental problems single handed. They have no quarrel with the individual man; it is the system under which the government as a whole is run that the suffragists wish to change.

To say that woman is on a pedestal; to appeal to women to cease their cry for justice on the ground that man's chivalric instincts will handle problems of social and civic justice, is blinding our eyes to

present-day problems and conditions and harking back to the Middle Ages. An occasional woman here and there may be on a pedestal, but women in the aggregate are not. We must face life as it is.

It is, perhaps, well that women are not on pedestals, because of the inequality that such a position typifies. During the argument on a proposed suffrage amendment in the legislature of one of the middle western states, a member arose in opposition to the bill and painted a picture of what he said he liked to think of woman as being — the womanly woman. To begin with, she was on a pedestal. She had a loving husband, a beautiful home, an automobile to carry her thither and yon, and servants to carry out her every wish. But in depicting her thus, he said nothing about the woman who worked in her kitchen, the maid who dusted down the stairs for her, the clerks in the store who jumped at her command, and the dozens of other women who slaved that she might be garbed as he described. Where were these women's pedestals? Alas, he had forgotten life as it actually is. He had forgotten the hundreds of thousands of average women who do their own housework, the millions of women in industry, the school teachers, the nurses, and all the others who must be taken into consideration when we are considering pedestals and justice. Such oversight is common with those who use this argument.

The opposition in Ohio used to tell the women there that they were on pedestals; that they were honored by being disfranchised, but that argument was punctured by a homely little incident that brought forth the real situation of the women of the state. A number of men in Adams County were charged with having sold their votes at one of the elections. The facts in the case were proven and the men found guilty—guilty of a great crime, not alone against the state, but against the nation. They had committed a grave offense, the judge told them, when they stood before him awaiting sentence, a crime that called for a severe punishment—and so he disfranchised them, placing them on the pedestal with the women of the state, along with the idiots and the insane!

How long can women be expected to be blind to such false reasoning? What is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. Disfranchisement cannot be a state of bliss for women and a criminal punishment for men. It cannot both make a pedestal for women and be a disgrace for men.

From the suffrage standpoint it is logical to consider next a group of anti-suffrage arguments which in themselves refute the argument that women are on a pedestal. Suffragists are called upon to tell what they will do with the ignorant woman's vote, the foreign-born vote, and the criminal vote, as

though that tri-headed challenge presented an insurmountable difficulty.

To those who have lived among the immigrant women and known them as friends and neighbors, the idea of the increased foreign-born vote being an argument against suffrage is hard to comprehend. Perhaps no group of women need the ballot more for their protection than those who, through a want of material resources, are forced to live in the slum districts of America's great cities. We fail to realize that it is often the people who have suffered most that have a contribution to make to society. These women know from their own life's experiences the meaning of bad city administration through bad housing, garbage accumulation, filthy streets, a police force blind to immoralities; they know from experience the need of legislation for the protection of working women, shorter hours of labor, and the cruel indifference of an electorate that tolerates child labor in this land which pretends to lay some claim to humane understanding and justice; they know from hard experience the need for control of the food supply, for proper inspection and sanitation.

If it be true that these women would drag down the electorate, why is it that the social workers of the country are almost unanimously in favor of granting the ballot to women? They surely, as no other group, know the immigration population of the

country. They know and have faith in this group because they have found from experience the higher motives with which most of these people sought the shores of this country, coming as they have with high aspirations, seeking new opportunity for self-expression and freedom for themselves and their children; they know that these same high ideals are shared by the women as well as the men, and that the ballot in the hands of the workingman's wife is as necessary for her protection as the ballot in the hands of the workingman himself. Of course, there are exceptions in this group as there are in every other group — women who would not use the ballot if it were granted to them, women who would vote as instructed, and women who would use it badly.

We must remember, however, in discussing the foreign-born vote that less than one-third of the immigrants are women. Thus, allowing all women the franchise would decrease proportionately the foreign-born vote. The vote of the native-born would still be in a preponderance, for there are about three times as many native-born women in the United States as all the foreign-born men and women together.

The argument against the illiterate voter strikes against the American-born as well as the foreigner, for where can one find denser ignorance than among some of America's oldest families that have gone to

seed in the mountains of the South? Allowing women to vote will increase the educated vote instead of decreasing it, because of the striking situation prevailing throughout the country in that our high schools are graduating over twice as many girls as boys.

Facts again show the fallacy of the argument that granting the franchise to women would increase the criminal vote, for only five out of every hundred criminals are women. It may be ventured that it is not this group that worries the opponents. It is a group few of whom see the prisons, because if caught in the net their fines are paid by those only too willing to keep them in their old paths. In other words, it is the prostitutes that are feared, the proverbial women dressed in scarlet, who have come down to us through the ages and for whom little consideration has been given until recently—and be it said to the glory of the "woman movement" that something is at last being done. For though "restless" the women of this age may be called, their restlessness has asserted itself quite distinctly in this direction.

The reports of vice commissions tell us that the number of prostitutes in cities is one-half of one per cent. In the western cities the number of these women who register and vote is depreciable. They do not stay long enough in one place, for one thing, and rarely seem to care to give the facts about their

lives necessary for registering. Several times scandal with reference to a group of these women being herded to the polls has been circulated, but on being traced to its source has been found untrue.

Morality has never been a test for man's voting. For every prostitute woman there must be at least one man guilty, and he is allowed to vote. With such a small percentage of the women of any community belonging to this class, it is preposterous to argue that all women should be kept from voting on that account. The vote of the vast majority of women who have high moral standards would far offset any danger to the community due to the immoral woman's vote. If morality is to be a test for voting, it should apply to men and women alike, and the penalty for both should not be paid by the sex less to blame. As long as one sex is kept disfranchised, the double standard of morals will prevail, for women cannot rise to a position where they can enforce their standards until they have the power of government back of them.

One of the prime arguments against the granting of suffrage to women has been that government is based on force, and as women are not capable of bearing arms, they had no right to have a voice in the government. Suffragists have always opposed this argument on the ground that governments derive their power from the consent of the governed. Now when the party in power in one of the great nations

comes forward and promises the ballot to the women because of their services in wartime, another of the impregnable forts has fallen.

The fight that the English women were making before the war broke out was a matter of comment wherever groups were gathered together the world round. The methods of the suffragettes were subjects for heated debates. Immediately after England entered the European War the internal hostilities ceased, and Mr. Asquith, who had formerly been compelled to use the most ingenious methods to escape from the suffragettes, and Mrs. Pankhurst were found speaking from the same platform during the recruiting campaign. Little was heard of the suffrage movement in England for nearly three years, and then from a clear sky came the announcement on the part of Mr. Asquith that he felt the women had earned the right to the ballot, and not only would he withdraw all opposition to the movement, but would use his political influence to help them gain the suffrage. This was followed by a statement on the part of Mr. Lloyd George for the government promising franchise reform which would give the ballot to the women of England.

What was back of the sudden change of viewpoint on the part of the English statesmen? For the first time they realized that women are capable of making sacrifices, of grasping critical situations and acting promptly in emergencies, and they realized it because

the women are finding expression in service identical with men. They had failed to perceive the value of women's work in times of peace because that service was not expressed in ways which they could comprehend; but when women went into the munition factories and produced the materials without which the nation would have been lost; when they began to replace male labor by the hundreds of thousands, going into the manifold occupations which had formerly been exclusively men's fields, seemingly then, and only then, was the English male political mind capable of appreciating woman power. But now, having awakened, the truly British love of liberty and fair play has shown itself: women are promised a fair chance, and justice is to be no longer a matter of sex in England.

The figures from England with reference to the service of women are tremendously significant. During the first two years of the war, the increase of women workers, exclusive of purely feminine occupations, was 866,000; of these, 766,000 replaced men, thereby releasing that number of men for military service. The first call was for workers in munition plants, but as time has gone on they have entered other fields. In building, mining, and quarrying, scores of women are employed. The bus and train companies have employed them; the metal trades were among the first to claim their services; the number of women in railroad work has increased two

hundred per cent, and there are now women ticket collectors, engine cleaners, and shopworkers, as well as clerks and carriage cleaners. There has been a vast increase in the number of women in commercial occupations such as clerks and accountants. More women are to be found working in hotels and places of entertainment, and agricultural pursuits have claimed their fair share.

No one in England can longer say that women's work is not affected by war, and that, therefore, they should have no voice in determining war issues and politics. And by no means have all the difficult problems arising from the war been settled. After it is over, there will be many matters to be readjusted, and women's brains as well as men's will be needed to help in the solution of the many problems that are sure to arise.

Women have demonstrated that they can do their bit in war time. War has also shown that women are the victims as well as the men. It has been argued that war was man's business and that women are protected by the men, but we can hardly find women the sheltered sex if we look clearly. From the beginning of time, war has laid a heavy hand on women as well as men; and so we find women are paying the price of the present war in many ways. We have just seen that the brunt of the industrial burden has fallen on them; they have suffered from the ravages of invading armies; the aeroplanes and

submarines have been no respecters of sex; as nurses, they have faced the battle fronts; and the mental suffering of the women who have given their sons and husbands is beyond estimating.

Affected as they are by war, they have the right to a voice in determining whether there should be war or not. What the effect of woman's voice in government would be toward war is, of course, unknown. Whether their attitude in this respect would be different from man's in the past, it is impossible to tell. We cannot judge by the past wars, because women had no part in making them; and in the present catastrophe woman's voice has not been heard, even indirectly, in the councils of the nations that are involved.

Having been told that "the female of the species is more deadly than the male," and having seen in the present strife that women have fallen into line and have taken the same attitude toward war service as men, it is perhaps not strange that some have maintained that their opinions would make no difference in the sum total of world affairs. But there is one thing in regard to women that must be taken into consideration: They pay the first cost of life. They are the bearers of the race; they know the value of life as men cannot know it. In the long run this instinct will make itself felt, and it will undoubtedly react against war with its hideous destruction of life. Woman is the creative rather than

the destructive force in life, biologically, and the mother-instinct, if given a chance to voice itself, will eventually throw its influence against the sacrifice of life.

Among the most prominent advocates of a bill which provided for a census of all the resources of New York State available for use in case of war —women's services as well as men's being included—were the anti-suffragists, though for years they had been saying that women ought not to vote because they are not subject to the countries' calls in time of war. With bland disregard for past arguments they joined the group commandeering women's services for the war, enumerating various channels in which women could work.

During the two weeks that this census was being taken, women by the tens of thousands left their firesides while they registered. The argument that the family counted as a unit, and that the husband did the representing, was forgotten. Each individual, whether man or woman, was compelled to answer this summons in person. Men and women mingled in these indiscriminate gatherings, in many cases standing a long time in line; not alone that, but women acted as agents of the government, anti-suffragists as well as suffragists, and aided in taking the census. It did not seem to occur to those opposing suffrage that women were going through an experience similar to voting, with the advantage in

favor of the ballot box because it would be secret, less personal, and not compulsory.

All of these prejudices have helped to retard the realization of women suffrage, but at the present time the real enemies of the movement are not often to be found working openly in the ranks of the anti-suffrage organizations. The effective enemies are not the vociferous opponents of the franchise in the hands of women: they are the quiet insidious influences working in the dark. Corrupt political forces, the vice and the liquor interests, are all against woman suffrage. It surely cannot be claimed that these are the influences that are protecting the home, building character, and developing the community. All the forces that drag down fear the effect of the woman in politics, and for the very good reason that they know she would array her powers against them.

Proof of this attitude on the part of the liquor interests is piled high at the office of the National Woman Suffrage Association, but one illustration will suffice. A circular was sent out by the Brewers' and Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association of Oregon to every retail liquor seller in the state when the suffrage amendment was pending, in 1906, as follows:

It will take 50,000 votes to defeat woman suffrage. There are 2,000 retailers in Oregon. That means that every retailer must himself bring in 25 votes election day. Every retailer can get 25 votes. Besides his em-

835667

ployes he has his grocer, his butcher, his landlord, his laundryman, and every person he does business with. If every man in the business does this, we will win.

We enclose 25 ballot tickets, showing how to vote. We also enclose a postal card addressed to this association. If you will personally take 25 friendly voters to the polls on election day and give each one a ticket showing how to vote, please mail the postal card back to us at once. You needn't sign the card. Every card is numbered and we will know who sent it in. Let us all pull together and let us all work. Let us each get 25 votes.

Not only have the vice interests fought suffrage in legislative halls and through political parties, but they have regarded it of enough importance to go into election district after election district, when amendments were being voted upon, to buy votes as they did in West Virginia and South Dakota, or to steal the ballots after election as in Michigan, in order to deprive the women of the right to the franchise. Because they realized that their very existence was at stake, they have not been content to play the game fairly and squarely. This is the best evidence that could possibly be presented for the extension of the ballot. The enemies to the cause are perhaps the greatest argument why women should be enfranchised.

# CHAPTER VII

## THE FORWARD TREND

WITH all the revolutionary changes that have been taking place in woman's world, it is not surprising that there are those who become confused. On all sides we find dramatic illustrations of how in one lifetime centuries of change have been bridged over. One such incident came to my attention at a settlement house where the author lived. The woman was an Italian by birth, and when only fifteen years of age had been married by her parents to a man she scarcely knew. Two children were born before she came to America with her husband, who was seeking the opportunities that had been held out to him. No educational advantages had been given her and her life had been the traditional one for women of her class—a blind submission to her father and husband. In America she found herself in contact with an entirely different attitude toward women, which had the effect of waking all the latent forces in her. She found the women here entitled to an education, so she worked, much against the wishes of her family, until she obtained a scholarship. With that beginning she fought her way

along through a profession, and became a leader among women and an indefatigable worker for suffrage. Thus in one woman's life has been depicted radically contrasting changes. In her life she has known the standards of several generations; has seen traditions thrown aside, age-old customs broken down, individual initiative developed. Is it any wonder there are people who are blinded by it all; who hold up their hands in horror and fail to see any hope, but only despair and disaster ahead? These see only the destructive features. They fail to understand that underlying it all there is a constructive side and so it is not strange that they are not able to appreciate what the right of franchise will mean to women.

Those opposed to granting the ballot to women are right when they charge that the ballot is only the entering wedge. The suffragists' construction of what that entering wedge means may be quite different, however. It is the all-around development of women that is to follow as one of the natural results of political freedom that gives hope to those who are struggling for the enfranchisement of women and courage to continue their struggles. It may be charged that such a statement may smack of feminism; and such is the intention, for the demand for the franchise is but one step forward. The franchise question is the center around which most of the battles for the cause of woman are

being fought. As Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale says:

> Feminism is that part of the progress of democratic freedom which applies to women. It is a century-old struggle, conducted by large groups of people in different parts of the world, to bring about the removal of all artificial barriers to the physical, mental, moral, and economic development of the female half of the race.*

With what seems to some people to be almost unreasonable impertinence, many women are questioning every tradition, demanding the reason for every custom, pushing aside conventions, investigating and rebelling — and all so suddenly. There is a restlessness abroad which many astute diagnostitians are trying to account for. Magazines are filled with analytical discussions, and prophecies of varying degrees of calamity are being made. And why? Because women are beginning to demand to be looked upon as individuals. Women have always been accused of being personal, and yet, with the utmost inconsistency, society with blind tyranny has tried to fit them all into the same mold. Deep rooted has been the common acceptance of the idea that women are in one class; that each has the same characteristics; that they think alike, act alike, and should be judged alike. What one woman does, all women are responsible for. It has taken tenacious

* *What Women Want.*

fighting and agitation in schools, home, and business to make people realize that there are as many kinds of women as there are kinds of men. And when it is thought that the issue has been settled and the matter proved, there arises now and then a relic of that old belief to show that the progress is slow.

It is against the tyranny of traditions which have long ago lost their reason for being, that women are protesting. They are rising up in revolt against a world which does not take into account the woman's point of view. They are asking to have a voice in determining, not alone the political conditions under which they live, but the economic, the spiritual, the moral, and the social. The man's point of view alone has for too long been the one taken into consideration. Well as he has done in the past, women, as wives, mothers, and sisters, and not as antagonists, are asking to have a share in determining the future. Their revolt is not against men personally; it is against a system. It is often hard for a man to see the wisdom of the unrest of the women in his well-cared-for family when it seems to him they are giving up a pedestal for something counterfeit; but one of the most interesting developments of the woman movement has been the awakening of the social consciousness of women when given a chance for individual development.

We find women asking the reason for everything, peering into every nook and corner. We

are warned against this discontent on the part of women. There is another and very hopeful side, however: it is when this very discontent makes the uneducated woman slave as a washwoman or a janitress in order that her daughters may have an education; makes the timid woman who sees her children starving join in protests to mayors and food commissions; makes the little foreign-born garment worker, unconscious of her power as a leader, rise under the tyranny of the boss and lead her sisters on a strike — it is the same brand of discontent that has led mankind upward in his struggles through the ages, upward in his fight against ignorance and oppression.

Thus we find women questioning the long-established position which they have held in the world, and asking the reasons for some of the inconsistencies that have always been accepted without question. It is this questioning and brushing aside of barriers with which women's lives have been spun around that is frequently spoken of as "unwomanly." Women have been expected to accept their assigned position in society without comment, and it is not to be wondered at that the upsetting of customs, precedents, and rules of demeanor has brought about surprise and opposition.

The process of revolting has served a purpose. It has been an education. As the difficulty of winning the suffrage has trained and educated women to

a degree to which no other group that has asked for the franchise has been educated, so the examination into the standards encompassing women has made them better able to balance values in life. This is not saying that women fully realize true values yet, or that they are making no mistakes in the process of changing. It will take many generations to wear off many of the characteristics which have been acquired through the generations of masquerading and tricks acquired by the custom of getting things indirectly instead of directly and openly; to acquire faith in their sex, which from childhood they have heard spoken of disparagingly; and to gain sure judgment, which comes only with the opportunity for self-expression.

Little by little we are beginning to realize that characteristics which we thought only masculine or feminine are not matters of sex, but of personality. Sometimes this realization brings joy and other times chagrin. For instance, heroism has always been associated with the masculine sex. The poets sing to us of the brave deeds done by the sailors on the sea, while tradition always has the women faint at critical moments when cool and calm heroism is demanded. Alas, these old conceptions are being upset. Now that so many avenues of action are open and women are having a chance for self-expression without having to abide by the dictates of convention, we are finding that heroism is not a

matter of sex. For example, a traditional heroism is already springing up around the telephone girl as it has around the hero of the wireless: A dam breaks and flood tides rise, the telephone girl sticks to her post and warns neighboring villages down the valley; a fire breaks out, and it is the telephone girl who stays to the bitter end and gives the warnings as others rush out; as the invading army presses on, the telephone girl in secret stands at her switch, "just like a man," and flashes forth her message. Feature articles are written of the individuals who did the deeds; editorials question and wonder how it happened that a woman did instinctively the thing that might have been expected of a man, until evidence is piled to such an extent that it is only the most obstinate or the densest who cannot see that these things are not a matter of sex.

Similarly, there are those who like to harp on the idea that women are the spenders and the wasters. When there is nothing else to blame them for, a charge of wastefulness can always be dragged forth — the efficiency experts are always of the masculine gender. A United States government official recently charged housewives with wasting $700,000,000 each year. Granted that this is true, it is a staggering amount, and every possible effort should be put forth to stop such extravagance. But analyzed from another standpoint, the case is not entirely against the housewives. It means the waste of two

cents per day for each person, or two-thirds of a cent for each meal. What group of efficiency experts in business could show a closer margin in a day's labor?

There is no wide and concerted effort among the feminists to subdue the male sex, to place the men in subjection and elevate the female of the species to a despotic rank. The problems of life are common to men and women. No solution of any permanency can be acquired without affecting both, no millennium is possible without men and women working for a common attainment. Living is not alone a woman's problem: it is man's problem also. Books without number are written showing woman's duty in the matters relating to humanity; magazines devote pages to the various phases of woman's responsibility to the family, the home, and the children. Are these not as much man's problems as woman's? Yet it is very rarely that emphasis is placed on man's obligation in these matters. No solution can be effected until this is realized, for they are human, not sex, problems.

It cannot be charged and substantiated that the home has suffered because of the changes that have come about. Abundant evidence proves that the present freedom of woman has not meant the retrogression of the home. Children are being cared for as never before, more intelligent study is being made of the problems of infant welfare, societies are

being organized for the child's protection, campaigns are being waged from one end of the country to the other teaching means of caring for them. Twice, through the Children's Bureau at Washington, a Baby Welfare Week campaign has been instituted and the gospel of prevention of infant mortality has reached millions of mothers. Compare the rate of infant mortality with that of the good old times of our grandmothers! The tiny tombstones in the old cemeteries are evidence enough of the slaughter of the innocents at that time.

Never in history has domestic science been given consideration equivalent to the present. It is no longer assumed that when the marriage vows are spoken an eighteen-year-old girl by some magic becomes equipped to take care of a home. Common sense as well as emotions are being called into play. The home is being put on a more scientific basis; motherhood is being placed on a higher plane. The records of our divorce courts are evidence that women will no longer degrade themselves nor stand for old conditions that for ages have gone unchallenged. It is not enough to decry the breakdown of the family through divorce; we must get back at the causes. Women are requiring a new moral standard on the part of the men, and the sooner men awaken to a realization of their responsibility in these matters the sooner will the home acquire a sounder foundation. It is a joint responsibility;

a condition for which men as well as women are accountable. Many are interpreting this period of transition as a bad omen, but to those who have faith in a better humanity, it is more like a growing pain. Out of it will come a wholesome companionship and a home whose foundation is not built on sand.

That there is an odium attached to being a girl may be seen among children everywhere. The boy who says he wishes he was a girl — when such a rare child can be found — is the laughing stock of all. The small boy is scolded for crying and told he must be a man, as only little girls cry. I know one mother who dresses her small boy in girls' clothes as a punishment. What else could his psychological reaction be but contempt for his sisters. Not alone in matters of punishment, but in the general upbringing of most children, the little girls are censored for doing the very things we praise little boys for. The continual and systematic repression of the spirits of girls from the cradle up has meant incalculable harm to the development of women. A revolt against this treatment was inevitable, for even the worm will turn, and the pendulum may have swung too far in some instances.

In other ways also in the training of children discriminations are made against girls. Boys are taught to prepare for their life; independence of spirit and social responsibility are drilled into them from early childhood. The father takes care to see that the

son is taught the essentials of good sportsmanship of life; he trains him in the give-and-take of the world's struggles, but never seems to think that it is as essential for the daughters to learn the same lessons in order to make a success of their lives. Then, as women, people wonder why it is that they are personal, seemingly unable to look at things in a broad way and apt to make mountains out of trifles. These are the result of training and not matters inherent in the female sex.

The present generation is awakening to the injustices that have been done women in these respects. This is shown by the many signs which point to a new conception as to the limits of woman's sphere. It is a rare exception now when the college girl is not planning to earn her own living, at least until marriage. It is often a dramatic moment in the life of a family when the daughter announces, on being graduated, that she intends to enter settlement work, take a position in an office, or become a teacher, in preference to staying at home and amusing the family. "My mother wants me to sit on the mantel and look beautiful," said one girl who was revolting against wasting some of the best years of her life.

In New York there has been organized a League for Business Opportunities for Women. The purpose of the League is to open to women occupations usually considered by the male to be his private realm. The members have gathered together in-

formation with regard to new fields, analyzed the type of qualifications necessary for success in the different pursuits, formulated methods of entrance, and then set about to help those who desire to try these new types. A bulletin is published which tells of new fields opened, inquiries by women who want to try their spurs in new territory answered, and in general the League acts as a clearing house to help women to help each other.

These illustrations show that the new generation of women are starting out with the idea of making their lives count to the fullest whether it be in the home or in business or in the professional life. The demand for equality of opportunity is at last having its effect, and bars formerly closed against women are being let down and a chance of achievement opened to them. It is for women now to show that they can stand steady under the new freedom. We have seen in history where groups of men have become intoxicated with the downfall of autocracy and the establishment of more democratic forms of life; likewise we have the extreme feminist as proof that freedom is sometimes too strong a draught for women also. It is unfair, however, to judge all men or all women by a few glaring misadventures. On the other hand, it behooves all women to realize their individual responsibility in these matters and not to mistake liberty for license.

Suffragists have been accused of being free-lovers,

of advocating changes that mean the certain breakdown of domestic standards, and of undermining the corner stone of society — the home. The very opposite of these charges is the motive which has moved women to work for suffrage as one of the means of helping on the march of humanity. Those who ask for suffrage believe that the best marital standards, as a whole, can be acquired where both the man and the woman stand on equal footing. Theirs is the idea of partnership between two human beings who realize an equal responsibility in the matter of marriage. They are asking that woman shall have the right to be a person after marriage; that she may have the right to choose her work; that she may have the right to develop her capabilities without bringing down the odium of society upon her for not following the iron-bound customs set up for women centuries ago. They ask that women be given a chance to choose what sacrifices they wish to make, and believe that it is unjust and prodigal to expect each and every woman to fit her sacrifices into a pattern cut out for all women alike. The development of the mind comes through the exercise of that function. It is the assuming of responsibility and the chance to make decisions that develop the individual to the greatest capacity, and not the blind taking on of a moral cloak cut out by others.

To argue that freedom of action will make women

desert their husbands and abandon their families shows a lack of confidence in women, and is not very complimentary to the husbands. Does it not stand to reason that a wife who is free, and yet chooses to stay with her husband, is more valued by him than one like the bought Circassian wife of Turkey, for instance, who stays because no other choice is given her—and the husband knows it? Wife slavery is no better than any other type of slavery. To argue from these statements, however, that once given their freedom, free love is the result, is absurd and insulting. Through the ages women have carried their full share of the burdens with little complaint; changed economic conditions now demand changed opportunities. There is every reason to believe that women will keep their desire for the home, love for children, and faith in man. After all the ages of torture and trial, women still respond to the call of mother-love. Nothing can take it from them. He is blind who thinks that freedom of choice will do it. It is only as woman is true to herself that she can be true to society; it is only by making the most of herself that she can be the best mother and life partner to man.

The economic status of the married woman is dependent at present upon the attitude of the husband. The idea that an allowance belongs to a married woman never seemed to occur to the human mind until the present generation. If the husband

chooses, he provides liberally for his wife, or she may be able by indirect influence to wheedle money from him; if he is niggardly, there is nothing that can be done. Her services in the home have no economic value. She has been made to feel her dependence in many ways, and that her dependency is an accepted state is shown by the fact that she is classed with the non-producers by the United States census department. Yet who can deny that she earns the salary as much as the husband. A partnership in deed as well as in name is necessary. The woman who has earned her own money in business or profession will be loath to take a dependent position in marriage. It is true that the money consideration is not the only thing to be taken into account, but testimony is far from rare which shows how large an effect a niggardly attitude in the past on the part of the husband toward financial matters has had on the situation we are discussing.

Two things are breaking down the old status of economic dependence on the part of women: namely, that women have entered the working world, and that education has taught this generation to feel that they have a just right to demand a share of the husband's income. As long as the wrong attitude toward the work of the homekeeper remains, housework will continue to be looked down upon. There is no reason why women should not get the joy of compensation that should come with working,

in the home as well as in other kinds of work. The trouble has been that because it had become a drudgery, a stigma became attached to it, and in the first flush of freedom it has been cast aside. Like so many of these problems the way to solve this is not to rail against results but to find the cause of the difficulty.

Another of the battle fields that stands out prominently in woman's fight for equality is the conflict that has raged over the demand for a single standard of morals. Through the ages there has passed the tragic figure of the Mary Magdalene. Skirts have been pulled aside as she passed, lips closed against her name, society dumb and blind to what she represented. More recently she has been investigated, studied, but still condemned—and condemned alone, though the sin with which she is charged is one that can never be committed alone. Nevertheless, society has demanded that the woman alone should pay the penalty. Women accused of restlessness have begun to ask the reason for this state of injustice. Finally, society is awaking to the fact that it, too, is paying the penalty, paying it at a monstrous cost; paying it with lives of babies blasted because of vice; with blindness inflicted on the innocent and immoralities unchecked festering the lives of men and women, innocent as well as guilty.

The demand for a single standard first took form in a demand for a change in the laws dealing with

immorality. There were women bold enough to call attention to the fact that greater penalties were enforced for stealing property than for stealing the honor of little girls. They asked that the age of consent be raised to eighteen, a thing which seems reasonable enough, but which as yet has not been accomplished in many states. Other legislative reforms were sought, and although the written law has been changed, the fight against the unwritten law in the form of public opinion goes on. Women alone are still being punished for the crime of prostitution, while the law winks at her companion in vice. The enforcement of the law reflects the attitude of society in general. In New York a number of detectives who are attached to the night court are sent out on the streets to trap the street-walkers. A suggestion that an equal number of women detectives be sent out to bring in men offenders would without question meet the sternest disapprobation. Justice to both sides can never be meted out until both points of view are represented in the making of the laws, in the appointment of the judges and the others in authority who are dealing with the problem of immorality.

This noticeable change on the part of women in general toward the "fallen" woman is indicative of good in the future. A sympathetic and more humane attitude is taking the place of social ostracism and the stern relentlessness of but a few years ago toward

the erring woman. She is being given a chance to regain self-confidence, and instead of banishment and damnation on this earth, institutions and societies are being organized for her rehabilitation, a sign that the change of attitude does not mean a justification of sin, sex looseness, or a letting down of moral standards.

Out of all this foraging around among precedents and prejudices, out of the protesting and the questioning, sex loyalty is developing. The ability of women to work together has always been doubted. Although group action has not been developed among women as among men, the signs of the times are prophetic. Like men, class consciousness still has the greatest hold on women; but even that is losing its grasp and we see a great crisis. like a shirt-waist strike in New York or one of the state suffrage campaigns, bringing together women of all classes, society women working on committees with the professional women and the representatives of the laboring groups.

And like in so many other things we find that the ability to organize is not a matter of sex, but of training as well as opportunity. At a conference of girls' club workers in New York City called to discuss organization among little girls, it was found, as the workers related their experiences, that in the districts where the mothers were organized the little girls wanted clubs; but when the little girls came

from districts where there were no mothers' clubs, and only the fathers belonged to organizations, then the desire to organize was more prevalent among the boys.

Some of the strongest organizations in the country now are among women. Early in their fight for emancipation, the leaders began to realize that the best results could be obtained only by working together. The General Federation of Women's Clubs stands out pre-eminently as the best example of this new group consciousness on the part of women. Over two million women are banded together in this organization, which is working along so many fields of endeavor. Its membership includes professional women's organizations, mothers' clubs in tenement districts, organizations of farmers' wives, and clubs composed of the most aristocratic; and the breadth and vision of its program of activity cannot be surpassed by any man's group.

The hopeful thing about this recognition of the power of organization is the fact that it extends into all classes. It is a stirring sight to see several thousand workers in a given trade come together to discuss wages and standards of work, and consider their contracts with their employers for the coming year; to see tenement mothers organized to see if by concerted action they can get the garbage collected, sanitary housing conditions, and fire prevention; to see woman lawyers, doctors, and other

professional groups gather in organizations, not alone for mutual advancement, but to offer their services en masse for the betterment of women in general. Out of all this a new realization of the meaning of sex loyalty is developing which cannot help but affect the status of all women.

And where is it all leading us to? How are women going to use their new freedom? Are they going to assume the responsibilities that of necessity go with it, or are they going to make license of liberty? These are questions that confront us as we see the dawn of a new day, and with the hope and trust that is within us, we pray that they may realize their responsibilities; that they will catch the vision of those women who have given all that others might have the freedom denied them in their day. A tremendous obligation rests upon the coming generation of women, those who inherit these new opportunities without having had to pay the price of fighting for them. The temptation of the easy life, the life of the parasite as Olive Schreiner so vividly points out, will be the greatest test for many women. That they will strive to measure up to their greatest possibilities and carry on the work begun is the conviction of the feminists. Great is the responsibility resting upon the colleges and schools which are turning out the leaders of tomorrow! There is no need to worry about the woman who has known the real meaning of service, who has known the

reward of labor, for she cannot be tempted to a life of idleness and vanity; but to those who have not known these, the decision yet remains to be made.

The new leisure which is coming to certain groups of women as a result of economic changes is already a temptation to many. It is a temptation such as that which faced the women of Rome; and they chose wasted time and dissipation, with the inevitable result. History of the ages shows that disaster came when such conditions prevailed that women lived idly, never when they had their fair share of the work of the day. Are they in the future going to take all that has been done for them as women as a matter of course; are they going to forget the sacrifices that have been made for them and slip into a life of ease, luxury, and self-indulgence? They will not if the opportunity is given them to realize the true meaning of living.

In their new-found freedom women have made mistakes which can be pointed to by those who have eyes only for destruction. They often do foolish things, but if they did not, it would be a sign that they were not doing anything. Women can never be awakened to their new responsibilities by silence or inactivity. The harking back to the past will never solve the problems of the future, will never give the strength which is needed to face new conditions. It is only by giving a chance for free expression, a

chance to know and to judge, that women will be fitted to make decisions. To keep them secluded, hampered by traditions, will not fit them to stand on their feet. They will measure up to responsibilities only as trust is placed in them.

The development of woman has been a by-product and not a main effort of man in his fight for democracy. That she could have been of greater help if he had recognized her as a partner, he is just beginning to realize. The hope of the future is that men and women may stand together in their fight onward for social progress. Each has its own idealism, its own distinct contribution to make to the common life. It is only as each has faith in the other that the best in each will be brought forth, that the final goal can ever be reached. It is not alone a personal struggle, nor a struggle of one sex, but a dream of a better humanity that women are fighting for, and this dream can be realized by man and woman working shoulder to shoulder.

# REFERENCES


BEARD, MARY RITTER. *Woman's Work in Municipalities.* D. Appleton & Company, New York, 1915.

CATT, CARRIE CHAPMAN. *Woman Suffrage by Federal Constitutional Amendment.* National Woman Suffrage Publishing Co., Inc., New York, 1917.

DORR, RHETA CHILDE. *What Eight Million Women Want.* Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, 1910.

ELLIS, HAVELOCK., *Man and Woman.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1911.

GILMAN, CHARLOTTE PERKINS. *Women and Economics.* Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, 1910.

HALE, BEATRICE FORBES-ROBERTSON. *What Women Want.* Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, 1914.

HARD, WILLIAM. *The Women of To-Morrow.* The Baker & Taylor Co., New York, 1911.

KELLEY, FLORENCE. *Some Ethical Gains Through Legislation.* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1905.

MILL, JOHN STUART. *The Subjection of Women;* with a foreword by Carrie Chapman Catt. Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, 1911.

NEARING, SCOTT. *Woman and Social Progress.* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1912.

SCHREINER, OLIVE. *Woman and Labor.* Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, 1911.

SHAW, ANNA HOWARD. *Story of a Pioneer.* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1915.

SNOWDEN, ETHEL. *The Feminist Movement.* Collins' Clear Type Press, London, 1913.

SPENCER, HERBERT. *Principles of Ethics,* vol. II. D. Appleton & Company, New York, 1893.

WARD, LESTER F. *Pure Sociology.* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1903.

# INDEX


a, 73
na, 72
asia, 10
is, women of, 9
alia, 75

ornia, 72, 74, 82
la, 75
go, experience of women in, 58
ren's Bureau, 63, 109
lry, 14, 87, 88
tianity, 13
ial period, 16, 47, 48
ado, 71
non Law, 27
ulsory education laws, 78
nal vote, 92, 93

ark, 76
ce, 87, 109
stic science, 109
reform, 11

omic status of married women, 114-116
ation, right of, 24
t, women of, 13
Havelock, 4
l guardianship, 79

le sex, 3-6
ism, 102-122
nd, 75, 85
prices, 62
, government based on, 93
gn-born vote, 90, 91
lom of opportunity, 2, 120-122
h Revolution, 40

General Federation of Women's Clubs, 32, 83, 119
Germanic tribes, 14
Great Britain, 74, 94-96
Gynecocentric theory, 4

Hindu law, 12
Home, woman's place, 59-63, 86, 108-110
Homeric age, 7
Hutchinson, Ann, 30

Idaho, 72
Illinois, 72
Illiterate vote, 91, 92
Immigrant problem, 90, 91
India, 13
Industrial conditions, 21
Industrial problems, 66-68
Industrial Revolution, 16-23, 39
Infant mortality, 82

Kansas, 72

Labor legislation, 78, 79
Laws relating to women and children, 27, 78-81
League for Business Opportunities for Women, 111
Legal profession, 27

Magna Charta, 37-39
Male suffrage, 35, 48
Marriage, 9, 114
Medical profession, 26
Middle Ages, 36
Ministry, 27
Mohammed, 13
Montana, 73

National Women's Trade Union League, 67, 83
Nevada, 73
New Zealand, 75, 82
Norway, 76

Oregon, 72, 74

Pilgrim fathers, 16
Potential power of ballot, 56-58
Primitive conditions, 3-7
Professions open to women, 26-29
Property rights, 11
Prostitution, 92, 93, 116-118
Protection of home, 59-63, 86

Race restrictions, 50, 51
Reform Bills of England, 41, 42
Religious restrictions, 48-50
Representative government, 52-56; in England, 37-41; in France, 42, 43; in Germany, 43-45
Roman Empire, 36
Roman Law, 10

Sappho, 8
Seneca Falls convention, 23
Sex loyalty, 118
Single standard of morals, 116-118
Spartan state, 8
Spencer, Herbert, 3
Stone, Lucy, 24-26
Suffragettes, 94-96
Subjection of woman, 5-10
Sweden, 75

Tradition, 1-3
Tribal relations, 6

Utah, 72

Vice interests, 99, 100

War, 93-98
Ward, Lester F., 4, 5
Washington, 72, 74
Widowed mothers' pensions, 79
Wollstonecraft, Mary, 18
Women, working conditions, 21-24, 65-68; club movement, 30; interests of, 77, 78; watchers at the polls, 81
Wyoming, 71